A Reply

to

The Report

on

The Land-tenures and Special Powers

of certain

Thikanedars of the Jaipur State

by

C. U. WILLS

C.I.E. I.C.S. (Retired)

on behalf of the Panchpana Sardars (including Khetri)
and Seekar

by

JOHN JACKSON, Bar-at-Law

LUCKNOW

I. M. H. Press Delhi

PREFACE

— —

Mr. Wills' report claims to revolutionise the past history of Jaipur in the light of 'old Jharshai papers'. Traditions have been discarded; European historians and political Officers have been regarded as misled; old native chronicles as exaggerated effusions of bardic inspirations; Col. Tod has been depicted as having maliciously extolled the virtues of Shekhawats; the Jaipur administration is styled as totally blind regarding its own powers; and the State revenue officials as incompetent. The present Inquiry that is being made on the basis of that report is novel in the extreme.

Mr. Wills is a retired I. C. S. Officer. He had a fully organised staff working night and day under the supervision of competent Record Officers. The resources of a vast State were at the disposal of Mr. Wills, and al political files and documents of Jaipur Darbar and Jaipur Residency, not accessible to the Sardars of Shekhawati, were supplied to him. Even the inspection of British Official Records at Calcutta was not a difficult job. And so with all these facilities, the original security of Jaipur documents, study of papers and writing of the report were completed within a year and a quarter.

With Shekhawati Sardars the case was difficult. They lacked a perfect organisation. Their old papers were distributed at numerous places, and with numerous people. Most of them have been lost during times of warfare prior to 1818, and others lost sight of during the period of peace by disuse. The Sardars had no proper record offices The numerous historical books and authorities on which they have been relying during the last two centuries were now all alleged to be unreliable. A conqueror does not pen his own doings. "Man who maketh history hath no time to write it." All the papers and files in the Jaipur Record Offices and the Residency were not made accessible to them. The permission of inspection of Government Records was received very late and the copies of necessary documents, have not yet been obtained. There were other difficulties at the very start. In the beginning the date of arguments was fixed for February 1934 Then the case was to be taken in March This led the Sardars naturally to believe that they were not having fair play. It is practically impossible to prepare any case within so short a period It was only recently that the Sardars were informed that their cases would be taken in winter. Had this been decided in the

beginning, the Sardars might have arranged their programme accordingly, but on account of short adjournments, they could not take full advantage of the extension of time. The Sardars engaged the services of Mr. John Jackson, Bar-at-law of Lucknow and Pt. Harnand Sharma and C. L. Agrawal, two local lawyers. As Mr. Jackson had left for England in May, the work could not be started. Mr. Jackson returned from England on the 12.h July, 1934, and reached Jaipur on the 16th July. Immediately a hurried inspection was made of some of the Jaipur State Records and the legal advisors left for Calcutta on the 20th for inspection of the British Official Records. They returned about the 12th August. Bare two months were available to the counsels for study of historical authorities, scrutiny of Thikana papers and preparing the arguments. The whole case was to be ready on the 15th October and it goes to the credit of Mr. Jackson that he spared no pains and gave his draft to the Sardars on that day. It is further to be noted that Mr. Jackson was a stranger to the tradition and usages of this place, and had in the beginning little knowledge of the history of Jaipur and Shekhawati. It was an uphill task for him, which he performed admirably.

The reply to Mr Wills's report is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive. It is only a tentative reply upon such material as could be discovered and studied in a hurry by the legal advisors. The Counsels had neither the time nor the opportunity to study the old historical works on Shekhawati in Jaipur language. They could not get the copies of the British Official Records from the Imperial Records Room. Historical research can never be completed in so short a period. Consequently the present argument is not the final word on behalf of the Sardars It is liable to alteration if any further material is discovered throwing light on the issues in controversy at present.

The glory of a Rajput State is correlated with the strength and powers of its nobility, and the Shekhawats have always been loyal to the person of Jaipur Darbar and have shed their best blood for Jaipur at the call of their lord. Human touch, sympathetic handling of the present situation, a desire to be responsive to the feelings of the Sardars, a spirit of paternal guidance, and notions of justice and fair play rather than of administrative convenience are required and it is hoped that blood will prove thicker than water in the long run and Shekhawats shall ever remain contented component units of the Jaipur State, and loyal tributaries of the Darbar.

PANCHPANA SARDARS.

INTRODUCTION

It is proposed to set out here a reply to the Wills "Report on the Land Tenures and Special Powers of certain Thikanedars of the Jaipur State". This Reply is on behalf of the Thikanedars of Panchpana Singhana, (including Khetri) and of Seekar only. For facility of reference the Report and the Reply are printed side by side.

As it is a Reply it is necessary to keep the style of the Report in order to facilitate reference to each point that is dealt with. There will be naturally some passages that will be practically accepted and require little or no reply while others will take up more room than the report, but by keeping to the same numbering for each paragraph in the Reply that has been given in the Report it will not be difficult to compare the two

REPORT

Section — I. Introduction

1 In May, 1932, information was received by Mr S H. Bigsby, Member of the Jaipur State Council, that official papers in the State Record Rooms were being sold to interested Thikanedars for considerable sums of money The papers were seized; and investigation elicited the fact that irregularities of a similar kind had been of frequent occurrence in the past It was decided, therefore, to place the Record Rooms under strict control, to set the records themselves in order and to employ someone from outside the State to report, in the light of the material thus made available, upon the status of the different classes of Thikanedars I was invited to make this inquiry and took up my appointment, which was for a period of six months, on the 21st of October, 1932. Rao Bahadur Sardarsingh, M B E, a retired

REPLY

1. In paragraph 1 it is stated that official papers were being sold "to interested Thikanedars for considerable sums of money", but at no point in the Report is there any statement as to what papers have been abstracted, nor can one find any thing to show that in fact any relevant or important papers are missing. This indeed seems to be a mare's nest. Certain papers of no importance were discovered in the possession of a clerk of the Records Office. His removal of them, as they were unimportant, could not have been for gain or for the advantage of any Thikanedar. No Thikanedar is shown to have ever bought any papers.

member of the United Provinces Provincial Service, was appointed to assist me in the capacity of Records Officer.

2 Valuable preparatory work had been carried out under the orders of the Inspector General of Police; and I was able, immediately on arrival, to begin my preliminary study of the problem The general condition, however, of the old State Records was chaotic From Amber alone a mass of unclassified papers had to be conveyed for examination to Jaipur, and their condition can be gauged from the fact that, after the removal of those which were legible, there remained cartloads of detritus from decaying documents Amber was only one of many places from which old records had to be obtained The Diwani Huzuri in Jaipur was another important repository, and was, indeed, the chief source from which papers had been dishonestly abstracted. There were also the Mustaufi office, the office of the Kharíta and Parwana Navis; the Kapatdwara: the Old Historical Records Office, the office of the Panch Musaoibat, and others of less importance None but the Persian section of the Old Historical Records Office possessed any system or offered any index to the papers, which were kept in heaps or tied up haphazardly in bundles It was impossible, of course, to reduce all this material to more than a semblance of order. The most that could be attempted was a summary examination of the papers with a view to classifying those which seemed to have some bearing on my inquiry. This work, which was carried out under the direction of Rao Bahadur Sardarsingh, was completed in about four months; and the selected papers were then subjected to a second scrutiny in my office.

At the same time a brief English abstract was prepared for every paper which, after the second scrutiny, was deemed to be of value; and, to facilitate reference, a serial number was allotted to the original paper corresponding with that in the English abstract. Eight such abstracts have been prepared under the following heads —

I Panchpana-Singhana; II Sikar; III. Khandela, IV Udaipurwati; V Patan; VI. Uniara; VII. General Maratha Period; VIII. General Mogul Period

3 A limiting circumstance arose from the necessity—as it seemed to the State Authorities—of keeping my inquiry confidential until it had taken definite shape It was not until the middle of February that this restriction was relaxed, and that I was authorized to hold informal discussions with the Thikanedars and their Agents regarding the documents in their possession and the history of their Estates These discussions were eventually completed for all the major Thikanedars, but the heavy office work, combined with the confidential character of my inquiry in its earlier stages, prevented me from touring in the interior and making first-hand acquaintance with the tract of country on which I am required to report.

4 A further difficulty developed from an unexpected quarter. I was aware before I reached Jaipur that a study of the old British Records of a hundred years ago would be necessary. In particular, the circumstances attending the Settlement between the Maharaja and his Thakurs after the British Treaty of 1818 A. D needed elucidation, since the documents reproduced in that connection in Aitcheson's "Treaties" had no relation to his narrative account of what took

4. This Paragraph is an opening reference to a paper said to have been signed by all the Jaipur nobles some two months after the treaty with Jaipur in April, 1818 and is printed in Part II of Appendix II of the Report.

It will not be difficult to show that Clause 2 of the document refers to the Khalsa lands of the Jaipur State and was

place After discussion, therefore, with representatives of the Political Department at the Viceroy's visit to Jaipur on the 3rd of December, a full explanatory letter was issued to the Resident on the 5th of that month; but in reply, nothing more was received from the Government of India than a memorandum, directing the attention of the State to the rules regulating the access of the public to Government Records for purposes of Historical Research

5 Application had now to be made to the Keeper of the Records in Calcutta; and eventually, on the 27th of January 1933, my admission to the Record Room was sanctioned. I left at once for Calcutta and had no difficulty in finding the papers I required never intended to refer to these domains of the Thikanedars. Clauses 3 and 4 distinctly recognize the "respective Jurisdictions" of the Thikanedars.

The attempt in paragraph 55 page 31 of the Report to treat the words Jagirs and Farms mentioned in Clause 2 of the articles set out in Appendix II as referring to the tenures of the Thikanas will be shown to be quite impossible when dealing with paragraph 55.

The original of the document, which was in Hindi, is not forthcoming. As will be shown further on, a very slight difference in the rendering in a translation would make all the difference to the meaning, but if Clause 7 be taken in its proper significance as recognizing such customs right of the Jaipur Durbar, as was an old standing right, it can only refer to customs dues within the Jaipur State. For it must be admitted at once that the Jaipur State never has collected or received customs dues in any of the Thikanas considered in the Report. The importance of the document as effecting the status of the Thikanedars has been stressed far beyond its capacity.

I was, however, not permitted to obtain copies of the documents I selected until they had been subjected to official examination. I, therefore, had copies prepared with the greatest expedition, and they were despatched for scrutiny on the 9th of February. Seven weeks later they reached the Resident in Jaipur, to whom it was suggested, for that officer's guidance in dealing with the case, that only such papers as had already been published or as had already at some time been in possession of the State should be handed over. This would have eliminated every paper I required save one. I asked, therefore, for some relaxation of these extreme conditions The case was again referred, by the courtesy of the Resident, to higher authority; and the major portion of the papers I had collected eventually reached the Jaipur Darbar on the 15th of April, six days before I left for Europe. Thus, up to within a week of my departure, I could not tell what evidence for the British period would be made available to me or what conclusion I could form; and I was compelled to write up my report in England without the assistance of an office.

6. While these negotiations for, the old British Records were in progress, I had to define the scope and character of my inquiry. The State Officials at headquarters had but slight acquaintance with the Thikanas. There were no Thikana maps or village lists; the statement of the revenue demand simply showed conventional figures for which no explanation was forthcoming; and even the list of revenue payers was admittedly incomplete. I attempted to obtain from the Revenue Department some classification of the

6. The first point to be noticed here is that even now after a thorough investigation of the Record of the Jaipur State and with the assistance of the whole Revenue Department it has been found impossible to make any "classification of the tenures on which the Thikanedars were *supposed* to hold".

While the Report has boldly asserted that all the Thikanedars originated in the same grade; *Viz*: "mere ijaradars" (See

quarries; three of them maintain their own police and exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction; and the one Thikana which has important mineral resources has been conceded the right to the minerals produced. Each Thikana, therefore, in these six areas, constitutes, in a greater or less degree, a Raj, so to speak, within the Raj, and I concluded that I should utilize the time at my disposal to the best advantage if I were to study the origin and history of the Thikanas in these six areas and reach some conclusion as to the character of the tenure under which they hold their Estates and as to the basis on which their special powers rest The six areas above referred to are:— I. Panchpana-Singhana including Khetri; II Sikar; III. Khandela, IV. Udaipurwati; V Patan; and VI Uniara They are indicated in outline in the Sketch Map reproduced as Appendix A, while some detail concerning them is given in Appendix B

dues were levied in every large estate in Jaipur proper by the holder. This was the cause of loss of income to the State. It was the regulation of these Dues within Jaipur proper that was the subject of the Agreement of 1818 and their regulation was again very carefully gone into by a later British Officer. His report will be filed if a copy is given by the Government of India in time for its being produced. But the Agreement of 1818 set out in Appendix II had nothing to do with these Thikanas covered by the Report.

By degrees the Jaipur State has with the aid of minority administrations evolved a legislative and Judicial systems, a Police and an Excise administration. These reforms have been introduced and enforced to a greater or lesser extent in the Thikanas in a degree varying with their size and capacity to resist these encroachments on their internal arrangements. The result naturally is that no principle regulates this diversity. But these facts:—

That they are all outside the scope of the recent State Settlement operations and always have been;

That they are all "outside the Customs cordon and are treated for Customs purposes as foreign territory or *Ilaqa ghair*";

That "all the Thikanedars in these areas enjoy the privileges of manufacturing

and selling intoxicating liquor" and always have enjoyed these rights;

That "all but one enjoy the vend right for opium and other intoxicating drugs";

That "most of them take a royalty on quarries";

That "three of them maintain their own police and exercise criminal and Civil Jurisdiction";

That "the one Thikana which has important mineral resources" has had its rights recognised and admitted by the Jaipur State after the question had been carefully gone into and,

That "each Thikana therefore in these six areas constitutes in a greater or less degree a Raj so to speek, within a Raj" and have held this position for over the last 200 years seems to prove their rights rather than to suggest that these are rights "to which their holders make pretention".

The description of these Thikanas as each forming a Raj within a Raj is equally applicable to the British Commonwealth of Nations and in that light is a correct definition of their Status in relation to the Jaipur State.

8 Appendix C indicates under different heads the special powers or privileges enjoyed by the Thakurs in each of these six areas; but having no direct acquaintance with the administration either of the khalsa of the State

8. As pointed out in the previous paragraph, the Jaipur State itself never had Laws or Law Courts, Police or Excise departments until many years after the

or of its Thikanas, I have not attempted to consider the practical problem presented by this devolution of executive and judicial authority to subordinate Estate-holders. I am not in a position to offer an opinion on the extent, for example, to which the State's control of police or magisterial work in Sikar, Khetri and Uniara should be carried or as regards the advisability or otherwise of including this or that Thikana within the area over which the State monopolizes the control of intoxicating liquor and drugs I have, therefore, comparatively little to say about these special powers and previleges I shall, however, in a later section of my report show how this special prerogative has developed out of the practice of the past, and shall also direct attention to a few important conclusions to be drawn from the papers which have come before me

treaty with the British in 1818. Prio to that date there was only one procedure.

Whatever was displeasing to the State it attempted to correct by the employment of an armed force. The will of the Ruler was the only law and it obviously eliminated Law Courts. There were neither criminal laws nor police. Where it was deemed appropriate an armed escort was supplied; for the rest, people had their own armed escort. At times an undertaking was exacted from some of the Thikanedars not to commit depredations against the interests of the Jaipur State.

Excise regulations there were none.

As to Executive administration, normally the tribute was given in farm to the Thikanedar who was the local Chieftain. When he defaulted the Jaipur State gave the farm for the next year to one of its Bankers, or Qanoongos or took over the Thikana in direct management, *i.e.*, made it Khalsa. When arrears were paid or when the Thikanedar agreed to pay up the arrears and furnished a Security, he got back into management of his Thikana and was once more responsible to pay the tribute.

It is therefore inaccurate and casts a misleading light on the position to speak of the Executive and Judicial Powers of these Thikanedars, as coming to them by devolution. They started Executive and

Judicial administration on their own initiative with an *impetus thereto very probably* from the British Resident or other British Officer functioning in their neighbourhood at the time.

It is similarly inappropriate to speak of "this Special prerogative"—presumably refering to Excise—as having "developed out of the practice of the past". As Independent Chief each Thikanedar levied, in his own area, taxes for the manufacture and sale of Drugs, a right which has never been exercised in these areas by the Jaipur State and has never previously been questioned.

9. There are two distinguishable elements in the conglomeration of "rights" which collectively constitute the status or position of a particular Thikanedar. One of these elements is his tenure as a landholder, the definition of which involves a study of the origin of his holding, of the incidents which characterize it and of any peculiarities in the method of assessing the revenue demand upon it It is this part of the problem upon which I propose to concentrate the greater part of my inquiry ; and I have, therefore, with intention referred specifically to the land-tenures of Thikanedars in the title I have given this report The other element in the status of each Thikanedar is comprised in the special powers or previleges which he is, either with official authority or by prescription, permited to exercise within his Estate.

9. Here the Report touches on the main question. The Status of a Thikanedar. His tenure as a landholder. It is this principal qualification which is completely and absolutely excluded when the Report examines the position of the Thikanedar. The State papers show that he was almost consistently the person who engaged for the tribute in the beginning as a sublessee or subijaredar of Jai Singh II, the then Ruler of the Estate. It loses sight of the fact that he still paid the tribute even when the Jaipur Rajahs ceased to take farms or ijaras and consequently could not be paying as sublessee; but the Report fails to realize that the Thikanedar could neither take nor be given the sub-lease of the tribute unless he had great local influence by reason of his position as land magnate and Chieftain.

10 I may now give an outline of this report. Its character is primarily historical. I have, first, indicated the rapid territorial expansion of the State under Maharaja Sawai Jaisingh at the close of *the Mogul period* by means of the Farming or Ijara system. I have next dealt with *the Maratha period*, in order to illustrate the gradual loss of control by Sawai Jaisingh's successors, which culminated in the prostration of the State at the beginning of the 19th century and its acceptance of the British Government as the paramount power This gradual decline between 1728 (when the establishment of Jaipur City commemorated the

Section II

Section III

It ignores other evidence clearly indicating that the Thikanedar was the local landed proprietor and proceeds to the conclusion that, as he was the ijaredar, he was a "mere ijaredar" all along and is so still.

This misconception it is very necessary to combat from the start and to state clearly that these Thikanedars, having made themselves, by one means or another, the lord of the territory, then engaged for the tribute due from that territory. The reasons for this will be given very fully at a later stage. The other elements in the Status of Thikanedar — the powers which he exercises, arise from his being a local independent Chieftain and are in no sense privileges which he is permitted to exercise with official authority or by prescription. *They are inherent in his position.*

10. The Report itself S. 22 shows that Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh continued to the end to take (ijaras) leases of their salaries from the Moghul officials (Jagirdars) and his successors did the same until the Marathas imposed their tribute. With the Maratha the ruling power in that area, it was obviously no longer profitable to take leases of Officials' salaries (Jagirs) and the practice naturally was discontinued.

From the nature of the thing an ijara could not create territorial expansion. But those Shekhawats who had been

zenith of its founder's power) and 1818 (when the British alliance terminated Maharaja Jagatsingh's political nadir) is inversely reflected in the position vis-á-vis the States of its outlying Thikanedars The latter begin this period of ninety years as mere Ijaredars and end it as "practically independent Chieftains" I have done my best with the material at my disposal to give a general picture of this century of change I have next dealt with *the British period* Here the fact that the Settlement of June, 1818, has been entirely overlooked adds to the complexity of the situation I have tried to summarize the peculiar situation that has arisen out of the acceptance by the British of a mistaken theory regarding the original relation between the Maharaja and his chief Estate-holders, coupled with their practical recognition of the need to modify that relationship owing to the gradual rise in standards of local administration during the last sixty or seventy years After completing this general survey, I have given a separate sketch of the land tenure and assessment history of each of the six areas with which I am concerned, in order to define the *territorial rights* of the Thikanedars The penultimate portion of my report directs attention to the second element in the status of the Thikanedars—their *special powers* In this Section I have summarized the present position : but have deliberately refrained, for reasons already given, from examining it from a practical or administrative standpoint, an examination which I am not competent to make The report concludes with a *summary* which, after setting forth the problem in its wider aspect, enumerates those points which

Section IV

Section V

Section VI

Section VII

paying their tribute to Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh II. by reason of his leases (ijaras) of it, continued payment to the Maharajah even after he ceased taking ijaras. The reasons for this continuation after the Maharajah's right to it as a lessee or ijaredar had terminated will be shown in the Reply to paragraph 17.

The result however was that their Status was upheld because they paid the tribute.

In the matter of payment of tribute there was at a later stage a natural irregularity due to the condition of that part of India. Overrun by various Powers, some struggling for conquest and supremacy, some out only for pillage and plunder, these feudatory Thikanedars were liable to exactions from all sides. With the Jaipur State itself from 1803 prostrate and effete and hence losing control, there was no incentive or reason to fulfil their duty to pay the tribute. It is not a little surprising to find how much of it was nevertheless collected. The Status however of these Thikanedars as independent Chiefs was never altered during this period of ninety years. Nor was it ever questioned by Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh II or his competent successors, Maharajah Ishri Singh and Madho Singh, or by the self indulgent Ruler Maharajah Jagat Singh who died in 1818, the year of the Treaty with the British Government.

seem to press for settlement and upon which specific recommendations are put forward for the consideration of His Highness' Government

This accounts for their continuing to make their payments of the tribute, irregular though it may have been at times, in the state of affairs during the years 1730 — 1818.

But as to Territorial Expansion of Jaipur State by reason of Ijaras, there was none. Its expansion of territory towards the South is quite foreign to this Report and is not touched by this Reply.

Section II The Mogul Period up to 1750 A. D.

PART I.- JAIPUR TERRITORY UNDER CLOSE MOGUL CONTROL

11 The territorial history of the Jaipur State in pre-British times falls naturally into two parts, namely,

I The Mogul period up to 1750 A D: and

II The Maratha period, 1750-1818 A D

From the days of Akbar to the death of Aurangzeb the territory now included in the Jaipur State remained, for the most part, under close Mogul control I give in Appendix D, on the basis of the statistics recorded in the Ain-i-Akbari a sketch-map which shows the approximate distribution of the present Jaipur territory in 1594 A. D among the five Mogul *sarkars* or districts of Ajmer, Nagaur and Ranthambor (in the province of Ajmer and of Alwar and Narnaul (in the province of Agra) I have entered on the reverse of the map the statistics recorded in the Ain for the subdivisions (*mahals*) whose headquarters are noted in the sketch.

Section II. Part I. Jaipur Territory under close Mughal Control A. D. 1594 to 1750.

11. The Report in this section quoting a very short passage from Mr. Moreland's work, "The Agrarian System of Moslem India", has rather hastily assumed that the Jaipur Territory was under close Mughal Control. The period taken is the 156 years following 1594 ; a period which begins about 10 years before the death of the Emperor Akbar and continues to 7 years after the death of the Great Sawai Jai Singh, the second Maharajah of that name.

By Jaipur territory the Report probably intends to include Shekhawati territory. In Akbar's time, as appears from the Ain-i-Akbari, the area of the Shekhawat pergannahs of Amarsar under the Rao of Manoharpur was 8,49,809 Bighas and of Manoharpur 1,29,895 Bighas.

Khandela under Raisal Darbari consisted of the 2 pergannahs — Khandela and Rewasa. We only get the area of the latter, 3,01,171 Bighas. Khandela pergannah however has a larger area. Assuming it to have only the same area as Rewasa the total area of Shekhawati Territory comes to 15,82,046 Bighas (Ain: Blochmann Vol: II. pp. 176, 277).

At the beginning of this period the Jaipur State, as the Report correctly sets out in Para 14, was very small in area. But even so there seems very little justification for saying that the Jaipur Territory was "under close Mughal Control."

Rajah Man Singh in 1594 had been for two years the ruler of Jaipur and was "the most brilliant character of Akbar's Court ;" (Tod Vol: III p. 1338) and was also one of the most influential men in that Emperor's entourage. "He held in succession the Government of Bengal and Behar, the Deccan and Kabul. Rajah Man soon proved to Akbar that his policy of strengthening his throne by Rajput alliances was not without hazard; these alliances introducing a direct influence in the State, which frequently thwarted the views of the sovereign. So powerful was he, that even Akbar, in the zenith of his power, saw no other method of subduing him than the execrable but common expedient of Asiatic despots—poison;" (Tod Vol: III page 1338).

"Rajah Man Singh, it appears, commenced an intrigue on Akbar's death bed to obtain the succession of his nephew, Prince Khusru. The Rajah was too wise to identify himself with the rebellion, though he stimulated his nephew, and was too powerful to be openly punished, being at the head of 20 thousand Rajputs, but

the native chronicle mentions that he was amerced by Jahangir in the incredible sums of 10 crores or 100 millions sterling" (Tod Vol: III page, 1339). Though this is probably an exaggeration it would still show that the Rajah had amassed a large store of wealth and paid a heavy fine. It does not seem possible in the light of the above passage to consider Rajah Man Singh as having been under close Mughal control.

His successor Rajah Bhao Singh was invested by the Emperor with the Panjhazari, or dignity of a legionary Chief of 5 thousand. (Tod: Vol: III page 1339).

In 1625 Mirza Rajah Jai Singh became the ruler of Jaipur. "He performed great services to the Empire during the reign of Aurangzeb, who bestowed upon him the mansab of 6 thousand. He seems to have adopted "the unconquerable haughtiness of demeanour," which determined the tyranical Aurangzeb to destroy him. The chronicle says, he had 22 thousand Rajputs Cavalry at his disposal, and 22 great vassal chiefs, who commanded under him; that he was sitting with them in darbar holding 2 glasses, one of which he called Delhi, the other Satara, and dashing one to the ground would exclaim, there goes Satara ; the fate of Delhi is in my right hand; and this also, with the like facility, I can cast away". The only way that even the powerful

Aurangzeb could deal with the Mirza Rajah was by suborning his son to assassinate him." (Tod III p. 1340.)

To take another historian. "Rajah Jai Singh, first of that name, known best by his title of Mirza Rajah, played a conspicuous part in the reign of Shah Jahan between the years 1644 and 1658 " ... .. . "the state, though not larger or wealthier than some of the other secondary states, grew to be considered on an equality with the largest and most important states of Mewar and Marwar". (Irvine "Later Mughals" Vol: I page 43).

It appears clear that Mirza Rajah Jai Singh I did not pay any tribute to Shahjehan, for the Sanad of that monarch in favour of the Rajah (Appendix F of the Report) shows that the nominal tribute payable by the Rajah for his territory of Amber was very skilfully included in the amount due to him as the salary of his mansab.

There is no reason to think that Jaipur was under close Mughal control during his time.

Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh II was the ruler of Jaipur from 1693 to 1743. His qualities as a stateman, legislator, and a man of science are very properly dialated on by Tod, who further says that he "mixed in all the troubles and warfare of this long period of anarchy

when the throne of Timur was rapidly crumbling into dust. He does not consider Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh attained great distinction as a soldier—in this Irvine agrees with him ("Later Mughals" Vol: I, page 326), "though his talents for civil government and court intrigue, in which he was the Machiavelli of his day, were at that period far more notable". (Tod Vol: III, page 1342).

Contemporaneously with the development of Jaipur State under its Rulers there was a corresponding rise in the Status of the Shekhawats, who are a branch descended from the same Kachwaha ancestor as the Jaipur State Ruler. We may look at their position in the earliest authoriy, the Ain-e-Akbari (Blochmann's translation). In those times the way to position and wealth was not by increase of territory but by joining the Emperor's Army and obtaining high rank in it with the opportunity of securing large spoils of war. While a big portion of the booty was sent to the Emperor, the commanders on the spot and the troops all received varying shares in the wealth taken from the enemy.

Of other Kachwahas; Rai Loonkaran Shekhawat, of the Manoharpur branch, held the rank of a mansabdar of 2000. (Ain, Blochmann Vol: I page 531). His son Rai Monohar the rank (mansab) of a commander of 1500. (ibid page 494).

His son Prithi Chand had the rank (mansab) of 500 and 300 sawars.

Monoharpur was up till the year 1727 a part of Shekhawattee territory but in that year it was forcibly taken by Jaipur and subsequently restored to the original owner's son, Bishen Singh. This marks the distinction between a Thikana which has lost and those which still retain their independence.

Another leading Shekhawat was Raisal Darbari. He is the ancestor of the Khandela, Panchpana Singhana, Udaipur, and Seekar branches which comprise the whole of the present Shekhawatee. He held the rank of 1250 (Ain, Blochmann Vol: I, page 419). He enjoyed a position of peculiar trust being in charge of the Emperor's Harem.

According to the Tabaqat he was raised to the rank of 2000 (Ain, Blochmann page 420) while the Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri translated by Rogers and Beveridge page 17 shows that Jahangir raised him to the rank of 3000.

According to Tod, with "Raisal the fortunes of the Sekhawats made a rapid stride. He received a grant of Khandela and Udaipur from the Emperor for fresh services". (Tod Vol: III pages 1383 — 1384).

With these acquisitions the area of the Shekhawat territory in the time of Akbar was appreciably larger than the territory

of Amber which even up to the time of Sawai Jai Singh consisted of only 3 perganahs Amber, Dausa and Baswa (Tod Vol: III p. 1351); while Shekhawatti comprised Khandela on the west and the adjoining area on its east marked Torawati and to the north-east of Khandela, the area marked Udaipurwati (See Report Map Appendix A).

Taking the area as arrived at above, Shekhawatti territory totalled 1582046 Bighas while Jaipur, as shown in the report, totalled 1135000 Bighas. These being Territories belonging to Chiefs they paid a lump sum as their Revenue or Tribute as is exhaustively shown in this reply to paragraph 13. These areas therefore cannot be said to be "under close Moghul Control" any more than Jaipur proper.

The Successors of Raisal Darbari in Khandela are set out in Tod Vol: III pp. 1385 — 1395.

At page 1394 he tells us that Rajah Jai Singh, who had regained his supremacy in Shekhawati, page 1393, was able to secure Dhir Singh the son of Fateh Singh a 2/5th share of Khandela, leaving Udai Singh with the other 3/5th, and gives A.D. 1716 as the date of this arrangement.

Raisal had 3 direct lines of descendants. The eldest branch remained in Khandela with which this Reply has no concern. In the second branch we come

to Sardul Singh, fifth in descent, who originates the title to Panchpana Singhana by usurpation in 1730 and in the third branch to Sheo Singh the 6th in descent who secured possession of Fatehpur by conquest in the year 1731-32. This brings the Shekhawati story as far as its earlier history is relevant to this reply down to the days of Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh II.

12 These detailed statistic of 1594 naturally suggest that in Akbar's time the Mogul administrative system was in full normal operation over most of the country now included in the Jaipur State; and such was, undoubtedly, the case The Rajputana Gazetteer of 1879 argues that "Of course the authority of the Moguls...... ...was far less extensive and less effectual than such a State Paper pretends to imply" (Vol. I. p. 45) On the other hand, Mr. W H. Moreland, whose recent book "The Agrarian System of Moslem India" is authoritative, has critically examined the position disclosed by the Ain's statistics of the Ajmer Province and describes it in the following terms: "The Mogul Province of Ajmer represents generally the modern Rajputana, excluding the eastern portions which belonged to Agra In Akbar's time the province was heterogeneous—some parts being administered on the Regulation System, while the remainder was left in the hands of Chiefs.........*Judging by the form of the statistics, three districts, Ajmer, Ranthambor and Nagaur, were administered mainly on the Regulation System.*" (Moreland p 119).

12. The isolated passage quoted from Mr. Moreland's "The Agrarian System of Moslem India", page 119, does not convey a complete idea of his views as to Moghul administration in Rajputana. It must be read with many other passages in the same book. It is enough here to quote from page 122.

"The facts which have been brought together appear to justify the general statement that, at least up to the fortieth regnal year, Akbar adhered to the Regulation system, and extended it as far as circumstances permitted, but made no attempt to enforce it without regard to local conditions; and the most interesting question remaining is: How far local conditions were recognised inside the Regulation Tracts? Or, in other words, What portions of those tracts were in fact left under the Jurisdiction of the Chiefs?"

"The data on record do not enable us to answer this question, for the indications on which we have to rely are of varying

districts of Alwar and Narnaul (in the Agra Province and, therefore, still closer to the *Mogul Capital) were equally subordinate* to the central authority The mere circumstance that the present Jaipur territory was distributed among no fewer than five different Sarkars and two different Subahs indicates *its former subordination* to the dominant Mogul The whole tract was within easy reach of the three great garrison towns of Agra Delhi and Ajmer; and was traversed by an important military route, the course of which is still marked by the old masonry "mile-stones" (kos-manarah). Since, then, the greater part of the country now called the Jaipur State was formerly under close Mogul control, it is essential that we should have before us at least an outline of the Mogul land-system, if we wish to understand how the more important local Thikanas, a product of that system in its latest phase, originally came into existence

"under the normal administrative system of the Mughuls" it was treated in the *manner 'Chiefs' country' was normally* treated. This was quite distinct from the manner in which lands, where there were only peasantry and no Chiefs, were treated. But the whole branch of the Moghul administrative system of land under Chiefs has been entirely omitted from the report as if there were no such system.

Accordingly, it is necessary to fill in this gap in the description of the Moghul land system by setting out at some length *what is meant by Chiefs and Chiefs'* Country.

Mr Moreland in his opening Chapter of the Agrarian System of Moslem India shows that the "Primitive method" was division between the peasant and the King. but over large areas with crops ripening at the same period this became difficult, wasteful and expensive. He then classifies "the various developments into 2 groups" (page 6).

A—Individual Assessment, or dealings direct with the peasantry.

B.—Assessment through *Intermediaries*

This brings him first to "Chiefs".

Who is meant by this term he proceeds to explain. "*Chiefs.* At the opening of the Moslem period, we find that large areas subject to the foreign kings remained in

the hands of Hindu Chiefs, who paid tribute for them in cash, and that the King's officers did not normally deal with the peasants in these areas, or meddle in their internal administration. In the earliest records the more important Chiefs are spoken of as Rana, Rai, or Rao, titles which still survive; their use at this period indicates that the Chiefs had been in theory, if not in practice, sovereigns in their own right, and that they had submitted to the new rulers, retaining most of their previous jurisdiction. As time went on, the Chiefs came to be designated collectively as Zamindars." . . . . "In the past the Chiefs' payments were determined on lines of which there is no precise record, but probably by agreement or by dictation, as circumstances might permit, while each Chief decided for himself in what way he should collect the State's share from his peasants." page 8-9.

He explains also *Assignees*. "The General idea indicated by this word is that instead of paying cash the State provided for future pecuniary claims by assigning to the claimant the King's share of the produce of a specified area," the assignment carrying with it executive authority sufficient to enable the assignee to collect the amount due. The right to such payment was called a "Jagir, An Assignment of the Revenue." (Moreland page 273).

He deals with the position of the Chiefs through the succeeding periods dealt with by him, see pages 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, 41, 58, 59, 63, and 64 for the 13th and 14th centuries.

"The position of the Chiefs was a matter of politics rather than of law. Ordinarily they could hope to retain their jurisdiction as long as they paid the stipulated Revenue. When they defaulted or rebelled the matter was settled by force or by diplomacy according to circumstances." (page 63).

"The Moslem administration was concerned mainly with the problems presented by the Chiefs, who, within the area of their authority, stood between the peasants and the Government. The extent of country allowed to remain in their hands cannot be calculated, but it was certainly important." page 64.

He then in Chapter III deals with the period from Firuz to Babur (1388-1526). "The Kingdom was now small, and within its reduced limits, the Royal authority was weak; the Hindu Chiefs tended to become independent, while the Moslem Governors were apt to be insubordinate."

"The position for the time being resembled that which we shall meet in the eighteenth century, when all titles and jurisdictions became confounded in the 'taluq' or 'dependency', that is to say the

area over which an individual whether Governor and Assignee, whether Farmer or Chief exercised *de facto* authority" page 66.

"The position of the Chiefs remained unchanged. In the sixteenth century, as in the fourteenth, they were Intermediaries between the peasants and the central authority; and *where they existed the Assignee had to look to them and not to the peasants for his income*". page 71

He then comes to the reign of Akbar 1556 — 1605 and sets out that Akbar found it necessary to make a new schedule of rates, page 88, which were "binding on the whole country to which they applied, with the exception—probable, though not recorded—of those tracts for which Chiefs paid a definite tribute instead of a varying annual revenue" page 92.

We find from the report that there was in these Thikanas no case of a varying annual revenue, but, on the contrary, a fixed annual payment. On page 96 there is a further important passage bearing on the position of the Chiefs in this reign.

"Direct management extended to what may be called the old provinces, Multan and Lahore, Delhi and Agra, Awadh and Allahabad, and also to Ajmer and Malwa; but there is no reason to suppose that

He deals with the position of the Chiefs through the succeeding periods dealt with by him, see pages 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, 41, 58, 59, 63, and 64 for the 13th and 14th centuries.

"The position of the Chiefs was a *matter of politics* rather than of law. Ordinarily they could hope to retain their jurisdiction as long as they paid the stipulated Revenue. When they defaulted or rebelled the matter was settled by force or by diplomacy according to circumstances." (page 63).

"The Moslem administration was concerned mainly with the problems presented by the Chiefs, who, within the area of their authority, stood between the peasants and the Government. The extent of country allowed to remain in their hands cannot be calculated, but it was certainly important." page 64.

He then in Chapter III deals with the period from Firuz to Babur (1388-1526). "The Kingdom was now small, and within its reduced limits, the Royal authority was weak; the Hindu Chiefs tended to become independent, while the Moslem Governors were apt to be insubordinate."

"The position for the time being resembled that which we shall meet in *the eighteenth century, when all titles* and jurisdictions became confounded in the 'taluq' or 'dependency', that is to say the

area over which an individual whether Governor and Assignee, whether Farmer or Chief exercised *de facto* authority" page 66.

"The position of the Chiefs remained unchanged. In the sixteenth century, as in the fourteenth, they were Intermediaries between the peasants and the central authority; and *where they existed the Assignee had to look to them and not to the peasants for his income*". page 71

He then comes to the reign of Akbar 1556—1605 and sets out that Akbar found it necessary to make a new schedule of rates, page 88, which were "binding on the whole country to which they applied, with the exception—probable, though not recorded—of those tracts for which Chiefs paid a definite tribute instead of a varying annual revenue" page 92.

We find from the report that there was in these Thikanas no case of a varying annual revenue, but, on the contrary, a *fixed annual payment*. On page 96 there is a further important passage bearing on the position of the Chiefs in this reign.

"Direct management extended to what may be called the old provinces, Multan and Lahore, Delhi and Agra, Awadh and Allahabad, and also to Ajmer and Malwa; but there is no reason to suppose that

it was applied to the territories of, at least, the more important Chiefs, and it is probable that the two last-named provinces, where such Chiefs abounded, were not very greatly affected ".

And then the passage which is quoted in the Report "The Moghul province of Ajmer represents generally the modern Rajputana, excluding the eastern portion, which belonged to Agra. In Akbar's time the province was heterogeneous, some parts being administered on the Regulation system, while the remainder was left in the hands of the Chiefs". Page 119.

There is a further discussion of the position of Chiefs on page 122, already quoted above to the effect that Akbar had regard for local conditions in applying his Regulation system and that it was an open question how far he attempted to apply it in tracts which were under the jurisdiction of Chiefs. The thing at any rate that could be said with confidence was that Rajputana was largely Chiefs' country.

It is necessary to pass on and come down to the time of Aurangzeb. To "Intermediaries under Aurangzeb and his successors."

For the position of the various kinds of Intermediaries *viz*. Chiefs, Assignees, Farmers and rebellious Mahomedan Officers "The eighteenth Century was thus

a period when *de facto* possession came to count for much more than title" "for possession was coming to be the only thing that mattered."

The passage quoted from page 173 with reference to Farmers being on their way to becoming possibly even Kings on the assumption of a continuance of the period of Anarchy probably would apply more readily to the Jaipur State than to these feudatory Chieftains who had no farms of any kind.

The next passage to be quoted from Moreland's Agrarian System of Moslem India is at page 267 and refers to the Statistics of the Ain-e-Akbari. He writes:—

"One of the most interesting questions arising out of these statistics is the interpretation of the figures relating to country in the possession of Chiefs. As an example, we may take the "district" of Bikanir, in the province of Ajmer (Ain, i. 512).

It contained II subdivisions, with an aggregate of 4,750,000 dams, and furnished a local force of 12,000 horse and 50,000 foot. The subdivisions are named, but no figures for them are given, the district being clearly treated as a unit; and there are naturally no figures for area. I think these entries can safely be taken as indicating that this "district" was in fact the territory of Raja Rai Singh,

who served as one of Akbar's high officers, and that the local force represents the contingent which he had undertaken to furnish when required. The aggregate may be read in one of two ways, either as tribute, or as a nominal figure. We know that at some periods Chiefs paid an annual tribute, not assessed by the year, but fixed by agreement in advance; and, from the financial stand point, such a tribute would be properly regarded as a Valuation, because it would indicate the probable future Income, though, from the nature of the case, this particular Income would not ordinarily be assigned to anyone except the Chief. I have, however, found nothing to show whether Akbar in fact claimed tribute from Bikanir or the other Chiefs in Ajmer, and it is possible that the figure is purely nominal."

"An example of how such nominal figures might come into the valuation is given by the account in the Badshahnama (II. 360) of the submission of the Chief of Palamau. The Viceroy of Behar had been ordered to reduce this Chief to submission, and marched into his territory. Eventually the Chief agreed to pay a lakh of rupees as *peshkash*, or present, and he was then appointed formally to the Emperor's Service, his country was valued at a Kror of dams, and was forthwith assigned to him. In this case the Valuation must be regarded as purely nominal. The Chief retained his country, but in point of

form he now held it in Assignment from the Emperor instead of as an independent ruler, and there was no question of tribute *being paid, apart from the ceremonial peshkash.* Such an arrangement was so obviously convenient that there is no difficulty in supposing it to represent a common practice." And finally at p. 268 —

"So far then as the more important Chiefs are concerned, it is possible, subject to the ambiguity as to payment of tribute, to interpert the statistics in the light of our knowledge of the period, the question remains whether it is possible to trace the *smaller Chiefs, who certainly existed* at this period The statistics treat each subdivision as a unit, and consequently it is hopeless to look for traces of Chiefs holding less than a complete subdivision;"

It has been found necessary to deal so exhaustively with this very old established tenure of Chiefs which dates back to the time of the ancient Hindu Kings and continues through the centuries to the period of the British Rule because it has been lost sight of in the Report and is most material to this Reply

To illustrate the point :— When Rajah Jai Singh II ascended the gaddi of Amber at the close of the 17th century the smallness of Jaipur State would justify his being described as a Chief as correctly as it would apply to the other Shekhawat Chiefs in Manoharpur, Khandela and

Udaipur. He might very properly be described at the early part of his rule as Primus inter pares. His subsequent rise to greater heights and his position towards these Thikanedars will be dealt with a little further on. It will be premature to go into that here. The point to be emphasised now is that part of the Moghul administrative system recognised Chiefs and dealt with their territories separately on a lump sum payment basis and treated directly with these Chiefs. This has been very completely substantiated and this, it is argued, was the position of these Thikanedars since the earliest times and has never altered.

Part II — The JAGIR SYSTEM and the AMBER RAJA'S WATAN

14 It will be apparent from Appedix G to this report that, at the beginning of the 18th century, the greater part of what is now the Jaipure State was in the hands of a number of Jagirdars, most of whom were Musalmans. The hereditary estates of the Amber Rajas were of very limited extent Inded, from the time of Akbar to the death of Aurangzeb, the outstanding local territorial feature—and a consequence, of course, of close Mogul control—was the small size of the patrimony or "watan" of Amber. This is plainly to be inferred from the detail in the Ain-i-Akbari, in which the cultivated area of Amber is shown as 1,135,000 bighas only, or about 1,100 square miles (taking the bigha as 5/8ths of an acre), so that the total area of the Mahal, including both cultivated and

Part II. — The JAGIR SYSTEM and the AMBER RAJAH'S WATAN

14. This part dealing with Jagirs requires to have the meaning of the term Jagir very clear in one's mind and the position or rights of the holder of a Jagir — The Jagirdar — correctly defined. This is more fully dealt with in S. 16, but in this S. 14, to speak of the Jaipur State as "in the hands of" a number of Jagirdars is a loose way of expressing the Jagirdars position. Neither in the Jaipur State nor in any other area can it be said that it was "in the hands of" Jagirdars. It was never in the Jagirdars' hands. He was entitled to collect from the area assigned to him that amount of the Imperial Revenue that was covered by his Jagir. That

uncultivated areas, was probably no more than from 2,000 to 3,000 square miles, as compared with an area of 16,682 square miles, included in the Jaipur State at the present time

was all. How he could effect that and from whom will be dealt with in S. 16.

It is said that the outstanding local territorial feature—the small size of the Amber Watan was "a consequence, of course, of close Moghul control". There is nothing in any paper or authority for the Statement that the small size of the Amber Watan was a consequence of close Moghul control. Nor does it seem a natural inference from the known facts. Rajah Man Singh was the most brilliant character of Akbar's Court, one of his leading Generals, constantly out adding by conquests to the area of the Empire and holding, in succession, the Governorship of Bengal, Behar, Deccan and Kabul. His ambitions led him to seek fame and fortune in Akbar's Service, but did not lead him to attempt to acquire an increase of territory or wealth by augmenting his own landed estates. His successor ten years later, Mirza Rajah Jai Singh I, followed exactly the same line of aggrandisement and distinction. They were both of them so powerful, so wealthy, so intimately connected with the Emperor by ties of marriage and service, which brought them very high rank and very exalted posts (See Farman Appendix F; and Tod Vol · III pp 1338 to 1340) that the extension of their landed estates would have been a matter of no difficulty had they desired it. Because their inclinations led them in an entirely different direction, not

the restraint of their Emperor, is more obviously the reason for their land estates not being extended

15 Nor is there reason to suppose that the Amber Watan was enlarged during the 17th century. On the contraay, we have direct proof of its restricted area at the beginning of the 18th century. A *parganah* of 1707 and a remarkable letter of 1712 stress the importance of securing for the Maharaja certain areas near to his Watan (see Appendix E), and, as some of these areas were situated in the immediate vicinity of Amber, it is evident that the extent of that permanent Watan was still extremely small Tracts as close to Amber as Chatsu and Manoharpur were included in the imperial crown-lands (*Badshahi khalsa*—Appendix G)

15. The period of Mirza Rajah Jai Singh I takes us very near to the end of the 17th century and the reason for his not extending his territory has been shown in the reply to S. 14.

The Parwana of 1707 and letter of 1712 referred to will be treated later, but a word may here be said about the former.

The Parwana of 1707 is of the last year of the reign of Aurangzeb, who had a fanatic antipathy to all Hindus. What the writer was trying to get is left shrouded in speculation. It was some sort of right in Mahals near the Jaipur Watan—perhaps as part of his Jagir. The translation seems inaccurate. It is more likely that it begins "You wrote to me that you can obtain" rather than 'to obtain' and further down the phrase about Rajputs seems to be "The people residing here who are to be controlled are Rajputs". In any case the Parwana had no effect on ijaras—if it is meant to refer to ijaras—for none was given before 1711.

It is worthwhile explaining the fiscal effect of Manoharpur being included in the Imperial Crown lands—see last line of this paragraph. That expression means only a temporary state. Land might be Badshahi Khalsa one year and not the

next. The Emperor at will changed a landed area from Khalsa to Jagir and conversely from Jagir to Khalsa (Moreland's Agrarian System of Moslem India page 20 foot-note). Whether Manoharpur was at any time Badshahi Khalsa or Jagir would not affect the question of its Revenue or Tribute being a fixed amount. It would only vary the personality of the receiver of that tribute.

16 The rest of the territory now included in Jaipur was, at this time, mostly held in Jagir or assignment, such jagirs or Assignment were, in the 17th century, characteristic of the Mogul administration of the land Instead of paying cash to its employees, "the State provided for future pecuniary claims by assigning to the claimant the King's share of the produce of a specified area, the Assignment carrying with it the grant of executive authority sufficient, at any rate, to enable the assignee to assess and collect the amount due. This institution is the most prominent feature of the Moslem Agrarian System. The area might be an entire province or a single village; the claim to be satisfied might represent the cost of maintaining troops, or salaries for civil or military service; and in normal times the bulk of the State's claim was assigned in this way." (Moreland pp 9 & 10) The peculiarity in the system which is important for our purpose is that, though an employee's sanctioned salary might remain unchanged, it was improbable that he would retain the same area as Jagir, in lieu of that salary, for any length of time When he was transferred from one post to

16. It is here necessary to prevent the entry of a misapprehension as to the position and rights of a Jagirdar. The Revenue was collected from 2 groups.

A Individual Assessment where the area was in the hands of peasants, when it would be estimation on the spot.

B. Assessment through intermediaries, where the land was in the hands of Chiefs or landed proprietors, when the payment would be a fixed sum.

In either case the Jagirdar to whom the Revenue of a certain area was assigned would be entitled to collect that sum from the peasants or the Chief, as the case might be, and would be able to call up assistance from the Imperial forces, if need arose. Even in the case of the peasantry the usual system was arrangement with the headman,—Group Assessment, Moreland styles it Jagirs or assignments were, as stated, subject to frequent changes to prevent an important Jagirdar acquiring great local influence, thus enabl-

another his Jagir would be changed; and, even without such a transfer, the assignment would frequently be shifted Assignees in any particular area were re-arranged every two or three years, perhaps oftener. Mr Moreland emphasizes the agrarian instability which resulted from these constant changes; but to create insecurity in the tenure of the State's employees seems to have been the settled policy of the Mogul Emperors The effect of this system of short, shifting assignments upon the position of the Kachhwaha Chiefs of Amber can easily be understood Their family had, ever since the time of Raja Bihari Mal, been holding high positions under the Mogul Emperors, for which, like everyone else, they were remunerated by assignments; but these Jagirs had no permanence, except in that portion which formed their patrimony or Watan. For example in 1060 A H (1650 A D) the Mirza Raja Jaisingh I held a Jagir worth 820 lakhs of *dams* in the following parganahs Amber, Chatsu, Phagi, Mauzabad, Jhag, Bahrana, Pachwara, Khori, Deoli Sanchari, Bharkol, Jalalpur, Umran, Sakras, Bawal ahd Jat Kalyewa In 1099 A H (1688 A. D), his descendant Raja Bishansingh held possession only of Amber, Baswa Phagi, Niwai and Sosner (see Appendix F) ing him to enlist large bodies of men for an army if he meant to raise the Standard of Revolt. Such influence would arise from constant association.

The only question of importance about a Jagir to Jagirdars was, whether it was in a locality where payments were likely to come approximately near to the amount entered as realisable therefrom and if it could be realised without delays and difficulties.

Maharajah Sawai Jai singh was the first Jaipur Ruler who turned his attention to obtaining wealth by means of taking leases from Jagirdars of their Jagir and he with natural shrewdness realised the difficulty for the Mohamedan officers in collecting from Rajput Chiefs compared with the ease with which he himself could effect the collection.

There is no question to be considered of "the effect of the system of short shifting assignments upon the position of the Kachwaha Chiefs of Amber." It did not affect them at all. They had their own plans in the times prior to Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh II. He, however, in 1711 started a new method of obtaining money and, as a very indirect result, influence. The condition of the times and the motives which actuated him are subjects for the following paragraphs:—

17. The Watan, then, was permanent. In an extreme case it might be resumed, as happened to Amber in 1708 when Jaisingh II backed the wrong side in war of succession after Aurangzeb's death; but this was altogether exceptional Normally the Watan was constant, whereas the Raja's ordinary assignments were continuously shifted with the deliberate purpose of preventing him from stabilizing his territorial interest While, therefore, the hereditary estates which the Amber House enjoyed by no means represented the whole of the territory under their control at any one time, yet it was the only permanent nucleus upon which they could depend. Tod's account of the position at the end of the 17th century emphasizes this territorial weakness "The Kachhwaha State, as well as its Capital, owes everything to Jaisingh Before his time it had little political weight, beyond that which it acquired from the personal character of its princes and their estimation at the Mogul Court Yet, notwithstanding intimate connection which existed between the Amber Rajas and the Imperial family from Babar to aurangzeb, their patrimonial estates had been little enlarged ......Nor was it till the troubles which ensued on the demise of Aurangzeb, when the Empire was eventually partitioned, that Amber was entitled to the name of a Raj.. ...At the accession of Jaisingh the Raj of Amber consisted only of the three parganahs of Amber, Dausa and Baswa The western tracts had been sequestrated and added to the royal domain attached to Ajmer The State boundaries were as follows —the royal Thana *(i. e* Mogul garrison*)* of Chatsu to the south; those of Sambhar to the west and Hastera to the

17. "The Watan then was permanent." This attitude towards a Chief's estates was eminently applicable to Maharajah Jai Singh's attitude towards these Thikanedars. If he had to take a Thikana under direct management or place it temporarily under the management of trusted men from Amber, it always reverted to the Thikanedar when he was prepared to give security and promised to pay any arrears and the annual tribute. But this sentence that "the hereditary estate which the Amber House enjoyed by no means represented the whole of the territory under their control at any one time," contains a statement comprising a variety of meanings

As important and influential men Rajahs Bhagwandas, Man Singh, Mirza Rajah Jai Singh I, — 1579 — 1667, — controlling very large armies with at least 20000 Rajputs of their own following and posted as Governors of various parts of the Moghul Empire, it may generally be said that the hereditary Amber estate which they enjoyed by no means represented the whole of the territory under their control. For they had such control of land of which the Revenue was at anytime assigned them for their salaries as would enable them to collect that Revenue, and again, as Governors, they had control of any Subah to which they were appointed as representing the Emperor From their

north-west; while to the east Dausa and Aaswa formed its frontier" (Tod III pp. 1350-51).

influential positions and with their large Rajput forces they may be said to have had control in all those districts from which their soldiers came. Here it must be emphasized that these Rajahs had such high positions that the size of the territory under their control may either be said to be irrelevant or to cover the whole Empire. The matter held as little importance for them as it does for any Prime Minister of England in the present century. The Report fails to realise that each of these Rajahs was in his day the power behind the throne. Swaying the policies of the Emperor, maintaining his rule throughout his dominions, adding immense tracts to his kingdom, the idea of adding a few thousand acres to their domains was too small to occupy their minds.

If, however, the sentence is not meant to refer to their times but to the later times of Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh II, 1699 — 1743, then the phrase requires careful examination. When Rajah Jai Singh II began his rule his estate consisted, as set out in this paragraph, of the 3 Pergannahs of Amber, Dausa and Baswa.

Aurangzeb had, by his bitter hostility towards Hindus and their temples — which increased as he grew older — alienated not only all Rajputs, but the whole Hindu populace. (Irvine Vol. II page

309) "He forbade fairs on Hindu festivals." "He dismissed the Hindu employees under him." (Commercial Policy of the Moghuls Dr. D. Pant, page 223).

With such a Monarch the Rajah must very early in life have had to exercise great astuteness and acumen to keep up his position in the official world, in the political conditions of that reign, and we know from Irvine (Later Mughals Vol I page 43) that he was only 21 at the date of Aurangzeb's death in 1707.

Aurangzeb was a strong ruler and the realization of salaries was therefore probably not so difficult as to render it advisable to give the job to some one else and accept from him the most you could get During his reign territorial expansion for a Hindu was a thought not worth entertaining, nor is there any reason to suppose that Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh ever, even in the years 1711 to 1743, the date of his death, the period during which he took ijaras or contracts from Mahomedan Officials, considered them a method of territorial extension. They were to him a source of steady pecuniary profit Throughout the period of ijaras up to the year 1750 when, as is set out in paragraph 22, the system of ijaras ceased, the position of the Jaipur Maharajahs

in this territory was that of ijaredars or farmers of the tribute payable by the Thikanedars. It is impossible to read into the relation created by these ijaras any higher rights for the holder of the position of ijaredar, than Collector of the assigned Tribute or revenue demand.

It would not be suggested, if any other person had been the ijaredar, that *his ijaras gave him any other right than* to collect the Revenue. Why should it then be different when the Maharajahs are the ijaredars? The sub lessees under Maharajah Jai Singh are called in paragraph 23 A "nothing more than Sawai Jai Singh's lessees or sub ijaredars". From this it must follow that his position was nothing more than the Superior ijaredar. Repeated assertion to the contrary cannot alter this logical result. But the fact that the Thikanedars took subleases for the payment of the tribute would not prove that they had no other Status. On the contrary, it was because of their Status as landed proprietors on the spot that they were given the subleases.

This relation between the Thikanedars and the Jaipur State has nothing whatever to do with expansion of territory.

The passage from Tod Vol: iii page 1351. dealing with the limits of Jaipur

.

PART III—SAWAI JAISINGH'S EXPANSION OF THE STATE BY THE FARMING SYSTEM.

18 Shortly after Aurangzeb's death (1707 A. D.) a peculiar change took place "Assignments, taken as a whole, had become unremunerative and were naturally unpopular....................The administration was gradually losing its hold on the country, officials were getting out of hand and strong men were beginning to assume an attitude of independence.........Assignees (Jagirdars) had lost the leading position they occupied in the middle of the 17th century Meanwhile other classes of intermediaries had increased in importance The decay of the central administration necessarily strengthened the Chiefs ....Farmers also (i e, Ijaredars, or contractors for the collection of the revenue) had similar opportunities

State, quoted towards the bottom of this paragraph; which begins, "At the secession of Jai Singh" is followed by the sentence "The Shekhawat confederation was superior to, and independent of, the parent State." These two chiefs ruled an area between four and five thousand square miles.

As has been shown above in the reply to paragraph 11, the relative areas of Jaipur State and Shekhawatti Territory as given in the Ain-i-Akbari bear out the correctness of this statement. As to the nature of the Supermacy of the Jaipur State, when and how it was regained, Tod sets out on pages 1393-5 of Vol; III.

PART III,—SAWAI JAI SINGH'S EXPANSION OF THE STATE BY THE FARMING SYSTEM.

18 Let us try and form some picture of the activities of Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh who came of age in 1707, the year when Aurangzeb, the iconoclast, died. He was the greatest astronomer of his day. His observatory and the astronomical instruments made under his supervision were the finest in the world Tod gives us some idea of his extraordinary skill in this science, Vol: III Page 1342-1344. It was with him a lifelong study. In his public character as an official we get much useful information from Irvine's "Later Mughals", which also illustrates the inefficiency of these later Emperors.

which were increased by a prolongation of the term for which Farms (Ijaras) were given ... The tradition of short-term Farms and frequent changes had by now given way Farms were commonly retained for life and might in favourable conditions be renewed to the heir, so that in English eyes they seemed to be hereditary tenures, and, at any rate it is reasonable to say that such Farmers were on the way to becoming Chiefs or, possibly, even Kings, on the assumption of a continuance of the period of anarchy On the other hand, the Chiefs who, though they may have had centuries of history behind them, had all along been in the position of Farmers from the strictly fiscal stand-point were as eager as the new men to extend their Dependencies, and we find cases where titular Rajas had taken large Farms in addition to their traditional areas" (Moreland pp 150-4 and 173) We see at once that the new Farming or Ijara System had this great attraction for the holder, as compared with the old Jagir or assignment, that it gave him some expectation of prolonged possession

Bahadur Shah having determined to punish him for having espoused the cause of his younger brother Azam Shah, set out in December, 1707, towards Amber, where he arrived in January, 1708; and on the 30th April 1708 Amber was made over to Bijai Singh, the Rajah's younger brother, (Irvine Vol: I pp 46, 47), and Jai Singh fled from the Imperial Camp accompanied by Rajah Ajit Singh of Jodhpur (Ibid p 49).

In June 1708 the Emperor learnt that the Rajah Jai Singh and Ajit Singh had made a combined attack on Amber and Amir Khan Governor of Agra was ordered to suppress them. A lying report of their successful defeat was made by Shujat Khan Subedar of Ajmere causing much rejoicing in the Imperial Camp. In August, however, the real truth came to the knowledge of the Emperor, that Rajah Jai Singh at the head of nearly 20,000 men horse and foot, had made a night attack on the fort at Amber and ejected Syed Husain Khan the Imperial Faujdar (Ibid Vol: I pp. 68, 69).

It was therefore a matter of only a few months before Maharajah Jai Singh II was once more in possession of his State. Conciliatory measures were adopted by Bahadur Shah. The Maharajah was restored to his rank of 2000 Zat with a gift of about 15000 rupees and a change effected in the Governor of his province (Ibid Vol: I p. 71).

In 1713 he was appointed Governor *of Malwa (Ibid page 262) and in May 1716* returned to Court from his Government of Malwa and was, at his own request, sent to subdue the Jats under Churaman, who had shut himself up in his fort of Thun (Ibid Vol: I, page 324). This kept him occupied for the next 20 months.

Churaman now managed to win over *Qutb-ul-Mulk, the* Emperor's Wazir, to his side with a bribe of 20 lakhs for himself and 30 lakhs tribute for the Emperor. The Wazir represented to Farrukhsiyar that 20 months had elapsed, that Rajah Jai Singh had received *a large amount of money, the monthly* expenses were very heavy, but no success had been arrived at. The result was that very reluctantly the Emperor consented to Churaman's terms and the siege was raised in 1718, much to the chagrin of the Rajah (Ibid Vol: I page 326). He apparently was making a very good thing out of the siege and the reason why Qutb-ul-Mulk put a spoke in his wheel was that when Rajah Jai Singh first came to Farrukhsiyar's Court, finding himself very well received, he had not thought it necessary to put himself in the good graces of the Wazir This neglect had been resented and was not forgotten *(Ibid Vol: I page* 327). Here, then, is an instance of a little slip which was at a future date to cause serious pecuniary loss to the Rajah and interference with his plans. He was

furious at this dénouement. He believed that victory was in his grasp. The terms made with Qutb-ul-Mulk and the Emperor might well have been made with him and the Emperor—if Qutb-ul-Mulk had not stepped in. Or there would have been a sack of the fortress which always included much booty for the General. There was more to be made by the employment of his talents and time by the Rajah in these big matters than in scheming to extend his territories through Ijaras. The incident shows that his position might easily be undermined if he had to go away to Shekhawatti and try to oust Thikanedars from their domains. To leave the Thikanedars in proprietary possession, while taking from them the money payable under the ijaras was preeminently the sound thing to do.

He is next shown as such an intimate friend of Farrukhsiyar that the Emperor personally visited the Rajah and attempted a reconciliation between him and Qutub-ul-Mulk. On the murder of Farrukhsiyar in 1719, the Sayyid brothers set up Mohamed Shah as Emperor, and it was determined to overawe Rajah Jai Singh by proceeding in force against him. The Rajah considered the position as serious and journeyed with all his forces as far as Toda Tank to meet the enemy. Here again one sees how necessary it was for him to keep the Rajput Chiefs on his

side rather than alienate them by any attempt to deprive them of their lands.

It then appears that the Imperial Commander, when he found how well supported the Rajah was, did not relish the idea of a combat. Negotiations were opened with Rajah Jai Singh. In the result he was persuaded to withdraw on a payment of 20 lakhs. (Ibid Vol : II pp. 2 - 4).

In 1722 the Rajah was appointed Governor of Agra and sent once more to crush the Jats, who were again ensconced in the fort of Thun. Muzaffar Khan was his second in command, a fact which shows the Rajah's status and the good relations between him and one of the leading Officers in the Imperial Court. In the result the fort of Thun was captured and Rajah Jai Singh in June 1723, as a recognition of his success, was created Rajah-i-Rajeshwar Shri Rajadhiraj, Maharaj Jai Singh Sawai (Ibid Vol . II pp. 122 - 124)

It is then set out in a passage by the editor Sir Jadunath Sarkar (ibid Vol : II p. 244) that the Rajputs, especially Sawai Jai Singh, were allies of the Mahrattas and actually called them into Malwa in order to weaken the detested Mughal power in Northern India He goes on to show that in 1731 the Mahrattas under Baji Row defeated the Imperial troops under the Governor of Malwa, Daya Bahadur, and killed him. Jai Singh warmly congratulated the traitor, Nandlal,

Chaudhuri of Indore, on this result, for it was he who had disclosed to the enemy that the Mandu pass had been mined, thus causing them to adopt another route. (Ibid Vol : II p. 248 and 310). The Emperor wrote accusing Jai Singh of having instigated this treasonable surrender of the province (Ibid Vol : II pp. 248, 149)

In 1732 Maharajah Jai Singh was appointed Governor of Malwa. In 1735 Khan Dauran "Sam Sam-ud-Daulah, the directing spirit at Delhi, and his bosom friend Jai Singh, thought it the highest wisdom to propitiate the invader". This throws an illuminating light on the power and political shrewdness of Maharajah Jai Singh.

There was a visit paid at this juncture on July 1736 by Baji Rao, accompanied by Ranuji Scindia, Malhar Rao Holkar, and Jaswant Rao Puar to the Maharajah, and Baji Rao is appointed Deputy Govenor of Malwa by the Maharajah (Ibid Vol : II p 256 and pp. 280, 284 and 285).

Even when the equivocal conduct of the Maharajah became clear, so strong was the political position of the Maharajah that the Emperor Muhammad Shah was unable to dislodge him. This is forcibly shown by the passage in "Later Mughals" at page 178 of Vol. II. "At this juncture the shortcomings of Rajah Jai Singh of Amber came into special prominence. For twelve years

he had been governor of Agra and for four or five been governor of Malwa. From the gates of Dihli to the banks of the Narbada he was in supreme authority. But in spite of all the disorder around him, the Rajah, supported by the Court influence of Samsam-ud-Daulah, sat calmly at home and did nothing, though he possessed an army of 30,000 horsemen and a still larger number of matchlockmen. Several times in previous years the Rajah had received from Muhammad Shah large sums, as much as thirty lakhs or twenty lakhs it is said, for payment to the Mahrattas. Half would be paid to them and half retained by the Rajah; the Mahrattas then went home and Jai Singh returned to his own State After two or three years of this procedure, the Mahrattas began to expect their "breakfast", as Warid styles it, and every time grew greedier and more avaricious, but for fear of Samsam-ud-Daulah's displeasure, Muhammad Shah was afraid to take away the Government of Agra or Malwa from Jai Singh Samsam-ud Daulah himself, although well able to do so, undertook no campaign against the invaders." (ibid Vol. II page 278).

This long description of the career of Maharajah Jai Singh is necessary in order to show what were in fact the objects and interests that filled his life He was deeply involved in machinations

and intrigues of every sort in those years when the power was, with his whole hearted but disguised support, passing from the Moghul to the Mahratta. This political development required all his time and energies. He had to see that he kept himself on good terms with the leading men at the centre of Government. He had to use them to forward his own aims. He was making large sums as Governor of two provinces with all the opportunities that those posts held out for him. He was making large sums in the various campaigns in which he was engaged. He was scheming to keep his own territory free from invasion and plunder by the new powers or by neighbouring marauders

These, then, were the occupations that absorbed the time and energies of this master of men and affairs. The conception of Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh being busily engaged in petty territorial aggrandisement is based on assumptions and inferences, but is not supported by evidence.

The ijaras brought in a steady income. As long as that kept on the Maharajah was receiving all he was entitled to. To have attempted to oust these Chieftains was to set up a strong local opposition which could never be eradicated and would have meant constant friction, expense and clan ill feeling. Indeed, thus alienated,

they might well have called in one of Baji Rao's, the invader's, agents (Malhar Rao Holkar, Ranuji Scindia) or a Mughal Commander to their aid. The men in his own forces were very probably Shekhawats in large numbers. They were at a later date recruited as complete Regiments in the British Indian Army. The Maharajah could ill afford a schism in the mainstay of his power, his Rajput troops. It is not, in the circumstances, reasonable to think that Maharaja Jai Singh was attempting to attain through his ijaras any territorial expansion

There are some documents which have been selected by Mr. Wills from the State records as proving the case he has set up. But when these documents are dealt with it will be shown that they tend to establish the case of the Thikanedars.

Every British authority who had to deal with these Chiefs has spoken of them as independent feudatories. Tod, the chief historian, has said the same

As their views do not coincide with the theory of the report they are to be brushed aside by the simple expedient of saying that Tod is wrong and assuming that all the others blindly, carelessly, unquestioningly, followed him. These authorities will be more thoroughly referred to further on It is enough here to combat the false basis of the Report at the very outset

19 At the time when the Farming System began to lend itself to the task of dismembering the Mogul Empire, Maharaja Jaisingh II was rising rapidly to the zenith of his power. He had succeeded to the *gaddi* before 1700, received the title of Maharaja from the Emperor Muhammad Shah Ghazi in 1723 (Irvine II p 124), and died in 1743 The length of his reign added greatly to his strength He had in 1708 recaptured Amber from the Imperial Faujdar who attemped to sequestrate it after Aurangzeb's death (Irvine I p 69), and 20 years later he founded the city of Jaipur in its vicinity Aurangzeb's fanaticism and the subsequent degradation of the Mogul Court had naturally affected the loyalty of the Rajputs; and Sawai Jaisingh was undoubtedly in sympathy with the Maratha, Baji Rao This again tended to strengthen his position Maratha incursions into Upper India occurred every year from 1732 to 1738, yet Sawai Jaisingh's territory seems to have been unaffected Thus on Vaisakh Badi 8 Sambat 1794 (1737 A D) Baji Rao Peshwa wrote to his brother Chimnaji. "Sawaiji has also sent us friedly letters requesting us to leave his territory undisturbed .... We do not disturb his territory as we except to get supplies of grain and fodder from Sawaiji on our way" (See too Irvine II 248). He was also the acknowledged head of the whole Kachhwaha clan. Last but not least, he had been appointed Subedar of Agra in 1722 and held this important charge (containing the districts of Narnaul and Alwar) for fifteen years "From the gates of Delhi to the banks of the Nerbudda he was in supreme authority ...... ; he possessed an army of 30,000 horsemen and

19. How the farming system lent itself to the dismemberment of the Moghul Empire is not very clear.

When as a consequence of the bigotry of Aurangzeb and the supineness of his successors the Mahomedan Officials found a hostile Hindu populace from whom they had to collect their salaries (Jagirs) it was only natural that they should lease (give an ijara of) the Jagir to an influential Hindu such as Maharajah Jai Singh II, if he was prepared to take it at a reasonable figure. This was not a cause, but a consequence of the incipient dismemberment of the Moghul Empire The eminence of the position of Maharajah Jai Singh and his pursuits, political alliances, financial undertakings, campaigns and official positions have been already dealt with and it has been pointed out that these factors do not raise the inference that he used his position to deprive his fellow Kachwahas, the Shekhawat Thikanedars, of their proprietary rights and internal independence.

a still larger number of matchlockmen"; while his friend, Syyid Muzaffar Ali Khan, a favourite with the Emperor and brother to the courtier Khan Dauran Samsamuddaula, held, first, the Deputy Governorship of Agra under Sawai Jaisingh, and then the Governorship of the Ajmer Subah (containing the districts of Amber, Nagaur and Ranthombor) from 1723 till his death, fighting against Nadir Shah, in 1739 (Irvine II, pages 123, 278 and 349).

20 The presence of a powerful Governor, with interest at court, support from Ajmer, a local *point d'appui* in his Amber Estates and a commanding influence among his Kachhwaha clansmen, had its inevitable consequence. Sawai Jaisingh proved himself a striking instance of a Chief who "took large Farms in addition to his traditional areas" I give in Appendix G to this report a statement showing some detail of the areas taken by the Maharaja in Ijara, so far as this can be known by reference to Account Sheets and other old records of the State

20. The commanding influence among his Kachwaha clansmen to which this paragraph draws attention is itself proof that he did not attempt to trample on their proprietary rights or independence. It has been shown that the taking of ijaras of Jagirs payable out of their Revenue dues or tribute would not in any way affect the Thikanedars' independence or proprietary rights. Such lump sum tribute was paid by Maharajah Jai Singh himself or was at any rate payable, but probably was assigned to him in part settlement of his Jagirs

It is hard to get much assistance from Appendix G. It seems to be only a partial list of Jagirs in ijara Whether all or any areas were continuously taken on ijara cannot be said, if the list is incomplete, as it is said to be. If they were not continuous there would be a break in the connection between the collector, the ijaredar, and the people

liable to pay the revenue demand or tribute.

It seems from paragraph 22 that ijaras were taken up to 1750 and the cessation of ijaras in that year was because a lump sum tribute was imposed by the Mahrattas which included both Jaipur and its feaudatories. As dominion in this region had now passed to the Mahratta, assignments of the revenue to Mahomedan Officials would not carry any validity. Taking ijaras of these assignments would be accepting a liability for payment. This would mean paying Revenue (tribute) twice.

It is enough to say here that the mere fact of the continued payment cannot be treated as evidence of loss of proprietary rights.

21 It will be seen that the process, by which these areas were, in effect, transferred from central to local control was not precisely the same as that which Mr. Moreland has described in general terms for other parts of the Mogul Empire In the first place, there is no indication of any irregularity in procedure. So far as we can judge, Sawai Jaisingh in every case acquired an authoritative Ijara (usually from Delhi, Agra or Ajmer) before he took possession of any new tract, and in every case he accepted liability for the annual Mogul assessment Secondly, we may notice the number of Jagirs or assignments still in existence at this time in the tracts which Sawai Jaisingh rented from the Mogul

21. Here the report ignores that feature of the Moghul Agrarian System which is called by Mr. Moreland "Chiefs" and the tribute of Revenue paid by them for the area under their control to which a detailed reference has been made in the reply to paragraph 13.

The area covered by the Thikanas of Panchpana Singhana and Seekar was Chiefs' territory, that is land for which the Revenue was paid by way of a lump sum tribute. As long as Maharajah Jai Singh had ijaras of that area he was entitled to collect from the local Chiefs the tribute

authorities This suggests that the final development of the Ijara System in this neighbourhood coincided with the transfer of the country from Mogul to local control Maharaja Jaisingh's position may well explain both these peculiarities So long as he was content to serve the Mogul Emperor as Subedar or Governor, he was interested in retaining the old system of administration by assignments When he realized that the Empire was doomed and proceeded to play for his own hand, he adopted the Farming System as the obvious means whereby to gain his end ; and, being himself in a high official position, he easily secured legitimate farming rights in any area which he thought he could control It may be remarked in passing that the list of Sawai Jaisingh's Ijaras shows that he occupied by this means an area much exceeding in territorial extent the present limits of the Jaipur State.

which had been assigned to the lessors of the ijaras The period during which he continued to take ijaras was roughly 1711-1743 It has been shown in the sketch of Maharajah Jai Singh's career that there was no serious interference with the Moghul rule until 1730, when, as noted in the reply to paragraph 18, Maharajah Jai Singh was secretly aiding, and establishing good relations with the invading Mahrattas. For the next 20 years, 1730 to 175,0 the Mughal government was still in working control of the Empire and no other power had wrested their kingdom from them It is true that in 1736 Baji Rao had extracted from the Emperor the Governorship of Malwa, (Irvine Vol : II pp. 184, 185) and in 1737 Baji Rao with his forces invaded Delhi, but having plundered it he was content to accept from the Emperor 13 lakhs and retire (Irvine Vol: II, page 298)

Still, these were only seasonal invasions and had not destroyed the Imperial Rule. It seemed to Maharajah Jai Singh to be safe to the date of his death 1743, to keep on taking farms (ijaras). The more disturbed the country, the cheaper would be the terms on which he would get them This had already begun to be the effect in 1726.

See P. S. 3, a letter from a Jaipur Official to Jaipur Headquarters. It concludes — "Formerly we paid Rs. 12,000

22 Sawai Jaisingh was now well launched along the path to territorial dominion over a wide area He was content, however, with *de facto* sovereignty To the end he continued to take Ijaras from the Mogul authorities; and his successors did the same until the Marathas imposed their tribute in 1750 The last transaction of this kind, of which we possess any record, is an Ijara for five Mahals in Shekhawati taken from a Mogul officer in 1751. It was only with the advent of the Marathas and their imposition of tribute upon Rajputana that the formal liability for payment to the Mogul Emperor seems to have been rejected by the Jaipur Darbar. Piecemeal payments for particular areas did not suit the Marathas The numerous Ijara dues which had satisfied the Mogul Court were abandoned: and, in their place, a lump-sum assessment was imposed by the Marathas The juristic effect must have been to give a definite unity to the Jaipur State The distinction between the Watan and the Jagir, or between one area under Farm from the Mogul and another, was obliterated, and the Maharajah of the day stood forth as the single representative of the entire countryside

22. There is here again mere assumption that Maharajah Jai Singh was setting up "*de facto sovereignty*" in these areas. If one considers the position of an ijaredar one realises that it never gave him an iota of sovereignty. Once he ceases to be ijaredar, his right to collect the revenue of the area formerly leased to him is at an end. While the ijara lasted, that was the only position he held--collector of the Revenue.

There is only 1 ijara of 1751. It appears that it was of the pay of General Salabat Khan. He had been running a compaign against the Rajahs Ram Singh of Jodhpur and Ishwari Singh of Jaipur. They had all come to compromise in the end This was the last year of Rajah Ishwari Singh's life. He agreed to pay Salabat Khan 27 lakhs if the Government of Agra were transferred to him. He did, in fact, pay only 1 lakh and got only the District of Narnol (J. N. Sarkar "Fall of the Moghul Empire" Vol: I p. 317, 318).

Rajah Madho Singh, his younger brother, who became ruler of Jaipur in the end of 1750, took this ijara probably to ingratiate himself with Salabat Khan. The Mahratta leader, Malhar Rao Holkar who had secured Rajah Madho Singh the Gaddi of Jaipur, had stipulated for an annual future payment of 5 lakhs. There was no reference to Shekhawatti Territory at the time.

The Tribute-paying Thikanedars continued to pay their tribute to the Maharajah of Jaipur. The alternative they might have adopted was to set up the objection that their tribute was due to the Moghul and that, without an ijara covering it, Jaipur had no right to it. But the result would have been that the Mahratta would have come on them with a heavy hand and their state would have been far worse, for they knew what the Mahratta was like when out for plunder—he had been ravaging all round since 1739 almost annually. There was only one thing to do and that was to pay Jaipur the tribute as before and let Jaipur stand between them, and the Mahratta if it could The juristic effect was that instead of being tributaries of the Moghul they became tributaries of Jaipur. This did not destroy their previous Status They remained as they were—independent tributaries. The arrangement was voluntary, in that they could have gone to the Mahratta direct, or to the Emperor if he showed himself the stronger ; or to any other power who could enforce payment of the tribute from them and give them protection against the rest There does not arise from this any ground for holding that the Thikanedars changed their position of independent Chiefs paying the same fixed lump sum for their territories which they had all along been paying

23. The fact that Maharaja Jaising was content not to assert his sovereign status (see para 223 below), but continued to the last to purchase from the Emperor Ijara rights in the bulk of his territory, need not lead us to belittle his achievement He was the real founder of the enlarged Jaipur State which bears his name Accordingly two points of importance for the present inquiry emerge from this brief summary of the situation—namely, that, in the first place, the territorial growth of the modern Jaipur State was a phenomenon altogether distinct in character, as it was distant in time, from those clan conquests which were, in early days, the usual method of expansion for a Rajput State, and, secondly, that the development of the Jaipur State to its present dimensions was a direct consequence of the collapse of the Mogul Empire in the first half of the 18th century ; and that that development, in so far as it was based on Ijaras taken by Sawai Jaisingh, followed, in the main, a normal course, such as we find repeated in other parts of Upper India about this time

23. As long as Maharajah Jai Singh and his successors continued to take ijaras (up to 1751), there is no room for the theory of sovereign Status. They were mere lessees of the Jagirdar's right to the Revenue of the área. There would arise from these ijaras no kind of territorial growth.

To say that Maharajah Jai Singh was content not to assert what he did not possess does not carry us much further in elucidating the Status of the Thikanedar. Throughout Rajputana and many parts of India there are these independent Chieftains who pay a local over Lord a tribute. The rights enjoyed by these Tributaries are infinite in variety, but the existence of independent Chieftains who pay a tribute is a common feature of all parts of India.

23 A When Sawai Jaisingh turned to the task of administering the new territories acquired from the Mogul Government by means of these Ijaras, he decided, naturally enough, to distribute them among subordinate Ijaredars Naturally too, in selecting his sublessees for the local areas into which he subdivided his new acquisitions, he showed a marked antipathy for Mahomedans and decided preference for men of his own Kachhwaha clan. Within a few years, therefore, we find Shekhawats established in the north, in what is now known as Shekhawati to the exclusion of the earlier Mahomedan

23 A. This paragraph takes us back to Maharaja Sawai Jai Singh with the ijaras. Once more the idea of his acquiring proprietary right by ijaras is erroneously introduced. It speaks of the Rajah as turning "to the task of administering the new territories acquired from the Moghul Government by means of these ijaras". It is absolutely incorrect to speak of acquiring territories from the Moghul Government by means of ijaras. In the first place

(Qaimkhani) holders; while the Haras of the south (with whom Jaisingh was at enmity—see Tod III 1497-9) were replaced by Narukas Khandela and Udaipurwati were already in his kinsmens' hands; and Sawai Jaisingh was content to leave them undisturbed on their accepting the assessment he imposed In Patan a Tanwar Rajput Zamindar was in possession; and for some years it is evident that the Maharaja contemplated ousting him in favour of a Rajawat family, but, in the end, the old holder was retained There can be no question but that Sawai Jaisingh had a perfectly free hand in nominating his sublessees in all these areas. He was under no obligation to retain the former occupants He was dealing with Mogul territory; and, therefore, applied precisely those materialistic principles which had always actuated the Mogul Government itself. He only retained such old holders as it suited his interest to retain Thus, before the Mogul period closed, Sawai Jaisingh had acquired a centralized authority and complete political jurisdiction throughout the whole of the territory under his control and he administered it by Agents, qualified either by their local standing and merely by their capacity to hold their own among a turbulent population These Agents were, at first, nothing more than Sawai Jaisingh lessees or subordinate Ijaredars, but: in the following Section, I shall have to describe the course of events which gradually, in the outlying portions of the Jaipur State, transformed these subordinate Ijaredars into semi-independent Tenure-holders, each regarded as the hereditary owner of his Thikana

the Moghul Government had nothing to do with the ijaras. The Jagirdar, that is the official to whom the Revenue of any area has been assigned, is the person who gives the ijara or lease of it. Secondly, no territory is acquired by any one who takes an ijara. The whole sentence is a complete misconception of the giver of an ijara and of the right acquired by the taker of the ijara. It must be pointed out each time this idea is brought forward that it is absolutely incorrect. Jagirs were rearranged every two or three years, as the Report itself says in paragraph 16. Obviously the ijara could not be for any longer period than the Jagir, as it was a lease of a Jagir. Did a farmer (ijaredar) acquire territory by taking a 2 year or 3 year Jagir on lease: Yet this idea of territorial expansion by ijaras is worked in all the time. Maharajah Jai Singh, as ijaredar, had undoubtedly a perfectly free hand in nominating the the sublessees of his ijara rights in all these areas. That only comes to this that the sublessees collected the Revenue on a sub-contract from him. But when we get to Maharajah Jai Singh only retaining "Such old holder as it suited his interest to retain" the point requires attention On the face of it, this refers only to the case of the Patan Thikanedar

The previous proprietors or Chiefs of the Sikar and Panchpana Singhana areas, the Qaimkhani Nawabs, were ousted by Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh, who by such ouster stepped into their shoes and acquired the position of landed proprietors or Chieftains, which had been formerly the Status of the Qaimkhani Nawabs. That they held such a status can be clearly gathered from the fact that these Qaimkhani Rajputs were such influential persons that they were styled Nawabs in the reign of the Emperor Firoz Shah Tughluq, and in 1453 A.D. Nawab Fateh Khan came and founded Fatehpur and set up a fort there. About the same time a relation of his took Jhunjhunu and became Chief of that area. (See Census Report of Marwar 1894, and Fakhrut-tawarikh by Mahomed Ramzan Faruqi 1905 A.D.).

Their importance is further proved by the Jaipur State paper S. 40. Sheo Singh writing to Jaipur Darbar says that they, meaning the Qaimkhani party, are taking the heir apparent of the Qaimkhani Nawab to the Emperor at Delhi to secure his assistance. Such action would only be possible for one occupying the position of a local Chieftain. As Qaimkhani Rajputs they had been there for nearly 200 years and held their territory as Chieftains. Their change of religion did not affect their Status as landowners. Sheo Singh and

Sardul Singh, the new landed proprietors, were given the subleases of their areas by Maharajah Jai Singh and his successors as "Agents qualified by their local standing to hold their own among a turbulent population."

The next point on which issue must be joined is the phrase "the local areas into which he subdivided his new acquisitions", because there were no new acquisitions, and there could not therefore be subdivisions of areas. There were only leases to each Thikanedar of the tribute payable for his own area The area could not be subdivided The right to collect the rent over each area could be subdivided between two or more sublessees.

That the Maharajah showed a marked antipathy for the Mahomedans and a decided preference for men of his own Kachwaha clan is correct enough. Also that "Within a few years therefore we find Shekhawats established in the North in what is now known as Shekhawati *to the exclusion of the earlier Mahomedan* (Qaim Khani) holders," this refers to the situation in 1730-1731, and requires careful study. In that period Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh almost simultaneously established themselves as Cheifs in this area, Sheo Singh in Fatehpur and Sardul Singh in Jhunjhunu. Sheo Singh was already a Chief in

Sikar which is some 15 or 18 miles to the South of Fatehpur, the Headquarter town of Kamyab Khan a Qaimkhani Nawab. While Sardul Singh was a Manager for Rohilla Khan, another Qaimkhani Nawab, at Jhunjhunu, as he had been for Fazil Khan, the Nawab's father. Evidence corroborating this is found in the State Paper P. S. 4.

The presence of these men then in that neighbourhood is not due to Maharajah Jai Singh's antipathy to Mahomedans, but that antipathy (see Irvine Later Mughls Vol: II p. 248 noted in para 18 of this reply) was no doubt instrumental in Sheo Singh's and Sardul Singh's getting assistance and support in 1730 from Maharajah Jai Singh when they turned out the Qaimkhani Nawabs and made themselves masters of the Qaimkhani territory. Nor was it due to Maharajah Jai Singh's having brought them there to be his sublessees. As shown above, they were already in that area. They saw a chance of extending their possessions by ousting the Qaimkhanis and took it. They became de facto rulers in the Qaimkhani country. The continued maintenance of their position could be greatly assisted by Maharajah Jai Singh's influence at the Imperial Court and no doubt was. In return these 2 Cheifs would have to continue paying the tribute formerly realised from the Qaimkhanis, for which

at that time Maharajah Jai Singh held an ijara.

To give them subleases of the ijaras he had taken was a natural method of getting this formally acknowledged.

This is the real explanation of the origin of these two Thikanas in 1730. It was their stabilised authority in those areas that led Maharajah Jai Singh to give them the subleases.

It would be a complete misunderstanding of the position to conclude that they had no Status in the area and were introduced from elsewhere by Maharajah Jai Singh merely because they were " men of his own Kachwaha Clan."

The Maharajah did not " administer " the country by agents qualified by their local standing, as said towards the end of the paragraph. What he did do was to give each of the newly established Thikanedars Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh a sublease of his ijaras in those territories Their position as his sublessees has not by efflux of time transformed them into tenure holders. They were already the masters of those areas when he recognised there position and made use of it to enable him to collect the Revenue due on their acquisitions.

Section III—THE MARATHA PERIOD 1750 to 1818 A. D.

PART I—AN OUTLINE OF LOCAL HISTORY.

24. It is a commonplace in Indian history to find a State, raised to prosperity by one great Ruler, doomed to repaid deterioration in less competent hands. The succession of Ishwarisingh, Sawai Jaisingh's eldest son, was challenged by

Ishwarsingh 1743-1750

Madhosingh, a younger son by a Mewari Princess who claimed the *gaddi* under his mother's marriage settlement. Ishwarisingh defeated the army of Mewar at the battle of Rajmahal in 1747. But three years later he was overwhelmed by his enemies, who brought in Mallhar Rao Holkar, and committed suicide. Madhosingh paid a heavy price for his success. He contributed a *nazarana* of 60 lakhs of rupees to the Marathas (M. P. 2 A); agreed to pay them an annual tribute of five lakhs of rupees; and surrendered to Holkar not only the Rampura-Bhanpura district which he held in Jagir from Mewar and had no right to surrender, but also the parganahs of Tonk and Rampura which formed an integral part of the Jaipur State. Thus, within seven years of Sawai Jaisingh's death, his territory became tributary to the Marathas, who secured a permanent footing within striking distance of Jaipur.

Section III—THE MARATHA PERIOD 1750—1818 A.D.

PART I — AN OUTLINE OF LOCAL HISTORY

24. There is practically no comment to be made on Part I Ss. 24—33 inclusive. It is only necessary to draw attention to two small passages.

25. Another disputed succession, this time in Jodhpur, again brought the Marathas into Rajputana in 1756. Raghunath Rao, the Peshwa's brother, secured the fortress of Ajmer, the key-position of Rajwara (R. G. (Vol: II page 18); and in the same

Madhosingh 1750-1767

year raised the Jaipur tribute to eleven lakhs of rupees (M. P. 92 A). The suzerainty of the Marathas was

25. Towards the end of this paragraph it is noted that at the battle of Maunda between Jaipur and the Jat Jawahir Singh "but the Kachwahas lost almost every Chieftain of note." These Chieftains are not likely to have joined up en masse in this personal quarrel of Jaipur if they had been alienated

now firmly established; for, even after their crushing defeat at Panipat in 1761; an attempt by Madhosingh to reject their claims upon him proved abortive; and he was forced to pay 25 lakhs, presumably as penaly for his refusal to meet the regular demand. His weakness was further exposed by Jawahir singh, the leader of the Jats, who in 1767 *defiantly* marched an army across Jaipur territory to the holy lake of Pushkar and back. At the battle of Maunda, near Khetri, which ensued, the Jat was defeated; but the Kachhwahas lost "almost every chieftain of note" (Tod III page 1360) and Madhosingh himself died of dysentery shortly after the battle.

26 Two successive minorities now made matters worse Prithisingh, raised to the *gaddi* at the age of five, died, either by poison or by a fall from a horse in 1778 at the age of sixteen, and was succeeded by his younger brother Pratapsingh Meanwhile Mirza Najaf Khan, the Naib Wazir at Delhi, was making his last bid for Mogul supremacy He encouraged the Naruka Chief of Macheri (Alwar) to throw off his allegiance to Jaipur in 1778 (R G. III page 180) and to defy the subsequent efforts of Maharaja Pratapsingh to reduce him to obedience, while Najaf Kuli Khan, one of Mirza Najaf Khan's officers, made inroads upon Shekhawati which adjoined the territory he held in Jagir Tod records that 'Nawalsingh of Nawalgarh, Baghsingh of Khetri, Surajmal of Bissau, all chieftains of the Sadhanis (Shekhawats), unable to comply with the requisitions (of Najaf Kuli Khan) were

Prithisingh 1767-1778

Pratapsingh 1778-1803

previously by Jaipur's ouster of their *leading men from their biggest Thikanas.*

26. The recrudescence of Moghul power here referred to began somewhere about the year 1772.

Our papers show dealings with the Moghuls from 1773-1789 evidencing honours and distinctions bestowed on members of the Panchpana Thikanedars' family, and direct payment of their *tribute to the Moghul in 1774-1778* and again in 1786-1789

The Thikanedars thus paying direct instead of payments by Jaipur, as there would have been, if the theory of the Report were correct, shows that as far back at least as 1730-1743 these areas were *not being administered by* Maharajah Jai Singh. These facts prove that the Thikanedars were still the local Chiefs in those years.

carried off and retained captive till ransomed for many lakhs of rupees" (Tod III 1397); and in 1780 we find Pratapsingh complaining to Sindia that Nawab Najaf Khan had taken possession of some of his parganahs and reporting the despatch of State forces to Shekhawati to oppose him (M. P 222 and 223) Mirza Najaf Khan died in 1782 and Najaf Kuli Khan, his chief supporter, in 1788: and with them disappeared the last hope of a revival of the power of the great Mogul Their activities, however, had weakened the allegiance due to Jaipur from the Shekhawat settlers north of the Aravali Hills; and subsequent events hastened the decline of the Maharaja's authority among his unruly kinsmen in this outlying portion of the State

27 Mahadji Sindia was now in the ascendant The treaty of Salbai in 1782 had recognized his independence of the Peshwa and encouraged his ambitious plans of carving out a kingdom for himself in Northern India He had a temporary reverse at the battle of Lalsot (*alias* Tunga) in 1787 when the nobles of the Imperial Court joined with Jodhpur and Jaipur against him Ajmer fell into Rajput hands; and for three years Jaipur paid no tribute (R G Vol· II page 18). But in 1790 the military genius of De Boigne gave Ajmer back to Mahadji and secured his complete surpremacy in Hindustan. The Rajputs were utterly routed—first at Patan, when the Rao of Patan "submitted to become a vassal of Sindia" (Compton page 54), and again at the still more memorable battle of Merta Pratapsingh had a heavy reckoning with the Marathas, who conducted

27. The same inference — that the Thikanedars were still the local proprietary Chiefs — is to be drawn from the fact that in 1792 the Mahrattas were "collecting the revenue direct from the Subordinate estate holders," as the report prefers to style them.

systematic operations through his territories in 1792 for the purpose collecting the revenue direct from his subordinate Estate-holders Nearly four and a half lakhs of rupees was levied direct by the Maratha forces from Shekhawati and over a lakh from Siwar and Umara (M P 256 A). The "gardish ka waqt" or "Time of Trouble" had begun.

28 Little would be gained from a detailed history of the quarter of a century of growing anarchy which was terminated by the British Treaty of 1818 It will suffice to refer briefly to a few outstanding incidents which illustrate the progressive decline of the Jaipur State's administration. Mahadji left for the Deccan in 1793, whereupon the long-standing jealousy between him and Holkar came to a head at the battle of Lakheri Taking advantage of this dissension Pratapsingh attempted to assert his independence ; whereupon De Boigne, after defeating Tukoji Holkar, marched on Jaipur and levied a fine of nearly a crore of rupees (Compton p, 76).

28. Requires no comment.

29. In 1799 Sindia's Agent, Waman Rao, engaged the redoubtable adventurer George Thomas, now Raja of Hansi near the Shekhawati border, to make an incursion into Jaipur—a territory which, as Thomas said himself, "had hitherto afforded a never-failing supply to my necessities" He captured Fatehpur, and, though compelled to retire to Hansi, received half a lakh of rupees from Pratapsingh for the suspension of further depredations Later in the same year he led a free-booting expedition into Mewar on which occasion he made Singhana the depot for his reserves of

29. Requires no comment.

ammunition and, incidentally, on his return journey, captured Surajgarh, levying another Rs. 50,000 from its inhabitants (Compton pp. 153 & 167).

30 The year 1800 saw the culmination of Pratapsingh's misfortunes. Driven to desperation by the exactions of Perron (who had succeeded De Boigne as Sindia's General) he, with Jodhpur's assistance, faced the Marathas at Malpura on the 15th of April 1800 He was defeated with heavy slaughter; lost seventy-four out of the eighty pieces of cannon which he had brought into the field with all his cam-baggage and warlike stores; and "never recovered from the blow to his power and prestige which was dealt him on this eventful day" (Compton pp 237-240)

30. Requires no comment.

31 Perron attended Pratapsingh's marriage in November, and in January 1801 marched south towards Malwa "On his way he levied a heavy fine from the Raja of Umara, a recalcitrant Chief who had recently defeated one of his detached battalions" On his return to Hindustan in October, Perron "called upon the Raja of Jaipur to pay up the tribute, promising, if he did so punctually, that, as soon as Thomas was reduced, he would march into the Raja's territory and put him in possession of certain revolted districts, in fulfilment of a promise previously given. On hearing which, Pratapsingh, who was a Prince ever in trouble with his own tributaries, sadly observed that 'General Perron had entered into many similar engagements but never performed any of them'" He, therefore, made direct application to Daulat Rao Sindia, complaining of Perron's conduct His application was intercepted; and Perron once more

31. Requires do comment.

turned towards Jaipur. Pratapsingh "scared at his approach, immediately paid the fine demanded" (Compton pp 244, 263 & 283). It is not surprising, therefore, to read in Lord Wellesley's correspondence with Lord Lake in 1803 that "the Rajput and Jat Rajas are disgusted with Maratha rule; but their dread of Perron's power exceeds their wish to be relieved ....M. Perron......
by the terror of his name and arms, holds in abject submission the Rajput States of Jaipur and Jodhpur" (Compton p 295).

Jagatsingh 1803-1818

32 Pratapsingh died in 1803; and the *closing chapter of the Maratha period coincides* with the reign of his son and successor, Jagatsingh Jagatsingh gained a brief respite after 1803, when Lord Wellesley, on the conclusion of the second Maratha War, formed an alliance with him, for the purpose of excluding the Marathas from Hindustan Holkar and Sindia were debarred from levying further tribute from Jaipur Holkar, however, in 1805 returned to Hindustan and laid siege to Delhi; the Jaipur Darbar was accused of not co-operating against him; and, in spite of the fact that, immediately afterwards, Jagatsingh's troops gave valuable assistance to the Bombay Army, under Major-General Jones, the British treaty was annulled in 1806 Lord Lake strongly insisted that, after accepting the assistance of Jaipur, the British were bound to overlook his previous failure to act up to the terms of his agreement His protests were unavailing; Sir George Barlow, the new Governor-General, was as set upon a policy of withdrawal as Lord Cornwallis himself, and Jaipur, therefore, was abandoned to the tender mercies of Sindia and Holkar

32. Requires no comment.

33. Meanwhile Jagatsingh had been provoked into war with Jodhpur for the hand of the Udaipur princess, Krishna Kumari. Sindia and Holkar hurried to take advantage of the quarrel Holkar realizing 18 or 20 lakhs from Jagatsingh, and Sindia 17, while the notorious Amir Khan and the other leaders subordinate to these two Chiefs continued their intermittent depredations The war was terminated by the murder of the princess; but Holkar was, by the Declaratory Article annexed to his treaty with the British in 1805, confirmed in his possession of Tonk-Rampura (which he transferred in Jagir to Amir Khan), and both he and Sindia continued to make regular levies on the Jaipur country Conditions at this time were so bad that Tod, a contemporary writer, records the opinion that this brief term of years "produced more mischief to Rajwara than the preceding half century" (Tod III page 1368 "The Jaipur State', another authority tells us, 'seemed to be at its last grasp Unprotected by the paramount power and helpless in itself, it lay at the mercy of all its unscrupulous neighbours and all the predatory Chiefs, who were continually looking out for some undefended quarter against which to direct their attacks That great Rohilla free-booter, Amir Khan ... ... whose ...... career had been one of unbridled excess, was pursuing his course of spoliation wherever the weakness of others tempted him to let loose his banditti, and another soldier of fortune, Shia Khan, was emulating the Rohilla in deeds of unscrupulous daring. The notorious weakness of Jaipur had long excited the cupidity of the former Chief, who in 1811 ravaged the country and reduced the

33. Requires no comment.

unhappy prince to a state of feebleness and prostration which bordered closely upon dissolution. Scarcely had Amir Khan quitted the Jaipur territory, when the Raja of Macheri (Alwar), known as the Rao Raja entered it with an invading army; and in the year 1812 took possession of the two forts of Dubbi and Sikrai with the territory adjacent to them" (Kaye I page 276-7) Alwar was then in alliance with the British who forced him to restore the territory he had seized; but the incident is indicative of the utter inability of Jaipur to defend itself. Such was the condition of the State at the time when the British, in preparation for their final throw with the Marathas, reopened negotiations for alliance with the Ruling Chiefs of Rajputana

PART II—DEVELOPMENT OF THE THIKANEDARS' STATUS

34 I have been compelled thus briefly to outline the course of events from 1750 to 1816 in the absence of any other narrative account of the local history of the period. Such a sketch is needed as a background to the tenure and asssessment history of the Thikanedars, given in a later section of this report, and also to explain the general development of their status

PART II—DEVELOPMET OF THE THIKANEDARS' STATUS.

34 There is, no doubt, room for forming a plausible theory of "development of Status" owing to the scarcity of the materials now available of the lives of these Thikanedars and the very slight efforts made to investigate even those that exist. In fact, however, we have no reason for saying that their style of living showed any improvement during the seventy years 1730—1800 or that they exercised any greater powers as time went on

One must bear in mind the complete absence of communications throughout the 18th century in this area; the method of travel, the nature of the tracks —

there were no roads — through this sandy land.

The nearest big town, of Panchpana Singhana, to Jaipur is Nawalgarh, which is 85 miles to the north. Even now there is no metalled road between the two towns. There was always great difficulty in obtaining sufficient water to drink in the Shekhawati country except in the tracts traversed by a river. This is related by Tod, Lt. Boileau and Elphinstone, all of them touring in the early years of the 19th century. In Irvine's Later Mughals, this difficulty for armed forces manoeuvering in these areas is frequently referred to. In Jadunath Sarkar's ' Fall of Moghul Empire " Vol: I page 317, we learn of the plight of General Salabat Khan and his army when quartered outside Jaipur settling terms with Jaipur and Jodhpur. He and his forces stood a good chance of being exterminated from want of water. In the rainy season even plundering Mahrattas retired every year (Irvine's Later Moghuls Vol : II).

To place subordinate ijaredars at such distant spots with such difficulties of access and expect them to hold the country and realise Revenues from such turbulent warlike freebooters as inhabited this region merely because they were the great Jai Singh's Agents would have been too utopian According to the

Jaipur papers, these two, Sheo Singh at Fatehpur, Sardul Singh at Jhunjhunu, had in 1731 first succeeded in ousting the Mahomedan Magnates, the Qaim Khanis Sardul Singh was already in Jhunjhunu connected to the Nawab by marriage and holding the position of his Diwan Can it be supposed that it paid him to oust the Nawab solely in order to become the subordinate ijaredar of Jai Singh ? Did Sheo Singh risk his life and fortunes with the likelyhood of having his estate of Seekar devastated and himself taken prisoner to Delhi simply to become a similar subordinate ijaredar ?

This conception does not recommend itself on a fair consideration of the times and conditions, the state papers, all the Government records, historic testimony and local tradition. These materials consistently support the position of these Thikanedars as independent masters of their areas from the start.

The existence of Chiefs and Chiefs' owned areas on a lump sum tribute paying basis in Rajputana is very clearly shown in Moreland's "Agrarian System of Moslem India." At these outlying points it is most likely that this was the character of the ownership of the land and the method of fixing the Revenue on it, and the Jaipur State papers are quite consistent with this

35 The gradual decline of the central power in Jaipur inevitably reached upon its relations with the holders of more distant Estates Umara rebelled in 1760, but Madhosingh was, at that time, strong enough to reduce the Naruka leader to submission. The Thakur was fined 20 lakhs of rupees and brought a prisoner to Jaipur. Eighteen years later, another Naruka, Pratapsingh of Alwar, broke loose altogether from Jaipur with Mogul assistance; and there was danger that the northernmost Shekhawat leaders of Khetri, Bissau and Nawalgarh would do the same Pratapsingh of Jaipur re-established his authority in Shekhawati after the death of Mirza Najaf Khan; but later, when the Marathas, with De Boigne and Perron in command, began actively to interfere in the affairs of Hindustan, the political cohesion of the Jaipur State was threatened The formal tie between the greater Ijaredars and the Ruler of the State was, indeed, retained, but unscrupulous Maratha levies, made indiscriminately either from the State itself or from its subordinate Estate-holders, fostered political disintegration. The Thikaneders grew relatively stronger as the

view. Taking this most reasonable construction of the position of these Thikanedars there is no occasion to speculate on a theory of "development of Status". A little examination, moreover, of the main happenings and deviations of dominion in this area during the next 70 years does not warrant the view that there was any development of Status for these Thikanedars.

35. As early as 1737 Thakur Nawal Singh founded the town of Nawalgarh and began the construction of a fort therein which was completed in 1745 (See Pt. Jhabar Mall's History of *Khetri p. 41*). *Such constructions can* hardly be the work of a man who was only a subordinate ijaredar in that area Who having newly acquired a territory would let a sublessee build a fort and found a town in his fresh acquisitions? Maharajah Jai Singh himself clearly treats Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh as the Masters of the areas conquered by them from the Qaimkhanis and arbitrates on their respective rights in those areas. He holds Sheo Singh entitled to Fatehpur (Seekar area) and Sardul Singh to Jhunjhunu area. (see P. S. 114). This is the only reasonable construction of this paper.

In 1738 Maharajah Jai Singh inquires from Maharajah Abhai Singh of

central authority grew weaker, though all were together subjected to a continuous process of reckless exactions

Marwar whether the armies of Bakhat Singh, his younger brother—who held 1/3rd of Marwar at the time—had gone to the assistance of Sardul Singh against Maharajah Jai Singh with or without his (Abhai Singh's) permission. (See Veer Vinod by Kaviraj Shyamal Das for this). Sardul Singh must have been more than a subordinate ijaredar to be able to enlist such a high personage in his quarrel.

That Sardul Singh had become turbulent at that period we learn from P.S. 93 of 1737

At some date before 1742 Bijai Singh Maharajah of Jodhpur, 1753-1793 married the daughter of Thakur Kishen Singh, the son of Sardul-Singh The latter carried out the celebrations of the marriage Therefore it must have taken place before 1742, for Sardul Singh died in that year (Jhabar Mall's History p. 43). It is impossible to think that he married into a family whose social position at best was that of ijaredar.

In 1773 the Jaipur State indubitably upheld the rights of all the surviving 4 sons of Nawal Singh to inherit equally the tract which Sardul Singh had acquired. (P.S. 311-316). These papers give a convincing proof that Sardul Singh was looked on by the Jaipur Ruler as having acquired the proprietary right in this Thikana.

The period 1786-1789 inclusive is very instructive. During these years the Tribute from the Panchpana Singhana Thikanas was paid to the Moghul as evidenced by Receipts still in the possession of the Thikanedar; and of that same period are three letters written by Maharajah Bijai Singh of Jodhpore to Narsingh Dass The first is of 1786 and says "I am glad that you at once went to Jaipur when you were called. Jaipur and Jodhpur are one. Your real worth will be tested in this matter." This was shortly before the battle of Tounga when the Rajputs defeated Madhoji Scindia. (See paragraph 27 of the Report. The death of Suraj Mall, son of Kesri Singh of Bissau, in this battle is commemorated by a small mausoleum at Tounga.

Then in 1788 Bijai Singh again addresses Narsingh Das asking him to reach Jaipur at once with a great force. "Your services are required to maintain the name and fame of the Kachawah Clan."

In 1789 there is a third letter to the following effect. "The army of Deccanis is very near. They will try to disunite you If you join them they will molest each of us severally. They will usurp your lands. It is to our advantage that Jaipur Darbar should remain. Deccanis will vanish in a few

days. Ultimate advantage is to be had from Jaipur Darbar."

It was not long after this, in the same year, that the battle of Patan was fought. Jodhpur, the Shekhawats and Patan, all had joined to help Jaipur, who at the eleventh hour stood aloof, thus causing the downfall of its allies. (Tod Vol: II pp. 876, 877; Compton p. 51).

The political arena shows many changes of the dominant power in Rajputana during the eighty years after 1730, the date when these Thikanas become Shekhawat Territory The Moghul retained control until 1750 The Mahratta, purporting to act as his agent,' displaced him in 1750. The Thikanedars pay the tribute to Jaipur who collects from them for the common overlord the Mahratta, who claims to be the agent of the Moghul. The Sikar papers show that Jaipur wrote declining responsibility after some 5 years and suggested that Sikar made its own arrangements. For two periods between the years 1770 and 1790 the Moghul reasserts his dominion and these Thikanedars pay their tribute direct to him Our Punchpana Singhana papers prove this. Then, as the Report says in paragraph 27—in 1792 the Mahrattas collected the tribute direct from the Thikanedars There is

no reason to infer any development of power by the Thikanedars upto this date. The next ten years—Report paragraphs 28-33—show the Jaipur Maharajah Pratap Singh crushed by De Boigne as *Agent of Scindia, plundered* by George Thomas, despoiled and routed by Perron, and dying in 1803, leaving his state very nearly paralysed. Neither the Jaipur Ruler nor his feudatory Cheifs were in a position to make headway against the Warring hosts who devastated their lands indiscriminately. There was no development of power open to the Thikanedars during this decade. Thus during the whole period of eighty years the theory of Development of Status is by no means justified It may rather be said to absolutely untenable.

36. Up to the close of the 18th century the Maharaja's authority had still to be reckoned with; and in 1799 Pratapsingh successfully advanced with a large army to the relief of Fatehpur, (in Sikar) when it was attacked by Thomas After the battle of Malpura, however, in 1800. Pratapsingh's death in 1803 and the withdrawal of the British alliance in 1806, conditions became chaotic. The bigger Thikanedars fortified themselves in their Estates, levied war on one another and were content, like Sikar in Khandela and Khetri in Babai, merely to acquire formal sanction from Jaipur for their encroachments when these were an accomplished fact. They were able to avoid those periodical payments

36. About Babai more will be said at a later stage in the reply.

The facts leading up to the recovery of Babai from the Rajwants by Rajah Abhai Singh of Khetri, which is what is here referred to, were fully set out in a letter in 1822 by the Rajah to the British Resident. It was not a case of encroachment for which a formal sanction was afterwards aquired.

There is nothing to show what service is referred to, or what support there is for the sentence " they evaded

of *peshkash* or *nazarana*—what may be called "renewal-fees"—previously levied whenever the period of their Ijara was extended; they evaded the military service which it had always been incumbent on them to render; they sucured a considerable reduction in their assessments; and, what is more, contributed nothing to the State except under compulsion, so that even their reduced assessments were most irregularly paid.

military service which it had always been incumbent on them to render;" or for the previous sentence, "They were able to avoid those periodical payments of peshkash or nazrana—what may be called renewal fees—previously levied whenever the period of their ijara was extended." Neither Sikar nor Panchpana Singhana can discover what these occasions are. The whole attitude of these Thikanedars as set out in this paragraph is infinitely more conducive to the view that they were Independent Chiefs than that they were subordinate lessees.

37. The outlying Thikanedars thus gained, during the Time of trouble, very considerable advantages in the readjustment of their relations with the State; but there is nothing to show that there was, at any time any recognized change in theessential nature of their territorlal tenure, beyond the fact that tenure acquired a permanent character Originally, their Ijaras had been in terminable, theory at any rate, at the will of the Maharaja; but the lapse of time, the weakness of the Ruler and the growth of a prescriptive title eventually created a land-tenure which was, by general consent, regarded as being of a hereditary and permanent description

37 It is true that the Thikanedars obtained considerable reductions in the amount of tribute payable by them, but that is the only readjustment that took place in their relations with the state There was never any change in the essential nature of their territorial rights But the reiteration of the statement of their only holding ijaras terminable at the will of the Maharajah must again be objected to.

In as far as they contracted under subleases to pay tribute due on their lands—which would come out of their rent collections—their position as sub-lessees would come to an end with the termination of the sublease. A default or large arrears accruing might lead to the Jaipur Ruler taking

the matter out of their hands and appointing others to realise the tribute direct from the peasants. That is all that could happen to them as subordinate contractors for the payment of their dues. It would not affect their proprietary title. The very fact that they were always reinstated proves this point. Such an arrangement prevails even now under the Revenue Law in Oudh. Government can take an Estate under direct management by appointing a Court of Wards Official until the arrears of Revenue are realised and it is satisfied that the proprietor will pay regularly in the future.

The Thikanedars' title is not based on a prescriptive right. It has all along been hereditary and permanent, The prodigality of Rajah Jagat Singh led to a fair number of Grants of his estate to his nobles and at times to less worthy persons. But the extent and value of the grants to the nobles was extremely overstated. There is in the Records of the Government of India a list of the grants liable to resumption made by the Resident of the day. If a copy is obtained it will be produced. They were none of them very large. This however was the only Ruler after Maharajah Jai Singh who is said to have been dissolute and it may be the case that some of the Jaipur nobles took advantage of their ruler. Rawal Bairisal and

38. As Mr. Moreland has shrewdly observed: "The position of a hereditary Farmer looks from the outside very like that of a Chief"; and we may go further and admit that Farmers, such as Sikar and Khetri, were, in Mr. Moreland's words, "on the way to becoming Chiefs, or possibly even Kings, on the assumption of a continuance of the period of anarchy". Nevertheless, the facts remain that the period of anarchy did not continue, that, in the end, none of these Thikanedars succeeded in severing the old customary tie which bound him to the Jaipur Ruler, and that in every case their tenure, as shown by their assessment, was, as it is to the present day, ultimately based upon an original Ijara. It would conflict with the mass of evidence collected in the course of this inquiry to assert that the Jaipur Thikanedars of today are distinct in their essential character from the Jaipur Thikanedars of the 18th century Their fiscal history is continuous throughout It is true that they gained great concessions in the Time of Trouble: but these concessions were, in every case, given in the form of some modification of their original agreement The original agreement was always, by consent of both parties, accepted as the fundamental basis of the relation subsisting between them; and that original agreement, was, in every case and beyond all possibility of question, a farming-lease.

the Regent Rani in the ten years or so following Maharajah Jagat Singh's death seem to have been far worse offenders. But there is no reason to think that the Thikanedars' Status in any way improved during the years 1803-1818.

38 The paragraph begins with a shrewd adaptation of two passages from Mr. Moreland's work on pages 158 and 173. Moreland was treating of the appearance to the eyes of British officials of persons whom they found in the position of hereditary farmers. That, however, is an entirely different set of circumstances to those of the Thikanedars of Seekar and Panchpana Singhana. Admittedly all farms had ceased there since 1750, so that when, some 50 years after, the British Officials are found describing the Status of these Thikanedars as feudatory Chiefs, it has nothing to do with persons who were found in the position of hereditary farmers.

To the above passage is tacked on a sentence from a passage at page 173 which runs "Farms were commonly retained for life, and might in favourable conditions be renewed to the heir so that in English eyes they appeared to be herediatry tenures; and at any rate it is reasonable to say that such Farmers were on the way to becoming Chiefs, or possibly even Kings, on the assumption of a continuance of the

The Ijara may have become permanent; the assessment may have been reduced and may have become stereotyped; the claim to a permanent and hereditary title may have been strengthened by agreement or prescription; but the essential character of the tie between these Thakurs and their Maharaja remained unchanged The basis of the tenure of their lands was originally an Ijara; and it is an Ijara still.

period of anarchy." Moreland expressly states that his remarks in Chapter VI "The Last phase in Northern India" are based on a study of the conditions in the United Provinces excluding Oudh, Kumaon and parts of Bundelkhand at about the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the 19th century. (page 157.)

The earlier paragraphs of this reply will have made clear that the Status of these Thikanedars was that of local Chieftains paying a fixed tribute by way of Revenue; which under farms became realisable by the Jaipur Rajahs and later by the same Rulers under the lump sum assessment of the Mahrattas. The grounds for holding that they had such status have also been set out as far as the necessity for doing so has arisen. When the later stages of the report are reached dealing with their territorial rights severally (pp. 44 et seq:) the details will be filled in.

The very fact that there was an "old customary tie" which never varied from year to year proves "their tenure as shown by their assessment" to have been that of tributary Chiefs. Because, if they were not Chiefs, then their assessment would have varied from year to year according to the nature of the crops and area of land under cultivation. Or, considered as being only

39 The alternative view — the view usually taken in official publications— is that these Thikanedars' Estates were not creations of the Maharaja of Jaipur; that their holders did not obtain them by grant or "patta" from the Jaipur State; that they were originally independent units, either coeval with Amber or, at any rate, in existence prior to the extension of that central authority over their territories, and that they were incorporated in the State by some sort of federal agreement which still entitles them to a measure of independence This view is no longer tenable, as the evidence of the State records proves conclusively Prior to Jaisingh's establishment of his authority over this wide area it had long been under close Mogul control. The units of which the Jaipur territory came to be composed were not independent units, able to exact conditions before submitting to the State's authority There was no question of a "treaty" with the Thikanedars or of "conquest" by Sawai Jaisingh. The latter simply extended his

subordinate collectors of Revenue — the period from 1711-1750 — the amount to be realised would vary each year for the same reason.

There are no materials in this paragraph for the conclusion that the tenure was an ijara and is an ijara still. Nor does this consequence follow from the fact that the Thikanedars, for a period some 70 years earlier, had taken subleases for the collection and payment of the tribute due on their estates.

39. The alternative view of their independent Status is only said to be controverted by the Jaipur State papers. Some obvious questions arise here. How did the Jaipur Maharajah and their officials fail to give this important information to the various British officials who came there to help them recover from the various nobles all those rights and domains which had been usurped ?

It may be that these papers have now been lost sight of for long years, but if they proved such a case so infallibly as they are supposed to do there was no difficulty in referring to them then. Every State Official of that day dealing with the Revenues would know of them These British Residents were all the time inquiring into this very question in the interest of the

administrative authority over a large tract of country, as a superior Ijaredar holding from the Mogul Government; and then proceeded to distribute the land among his own subordinate Ijaredars, some new men, others of old local standing These, whether old or new, enjoyed no such standing as could entitle them to claim to be in political relations with the Maharaja. All of them came within the orbit of Sawai Jaisingh's authority on the same level, as subordinate Ijaredar, holding the land he assigned them under a simple lease. This conclusion is further confirmed by the circumstance that the claim of these Thikanedars to a semi-independent political status rests upon a wholly incorrect version of their origin As we shall see, exaggerated pretensions to the independent sovereign conquest of their Estates have been put forward by some of the Thikanedars, and have been not only accepted, but even magnified, by British official commentators The accumulated misconceptions of a hundred years will, therefore, have to be removed before we can appreciate in its true perspective the internal structure of the Jaipur State.

British Government as the Government of India Records show. If they were mere ijaredars their revenue might well have been enhanced. Jhuta Ram, Chief Minister of the Regent Rani, had a bitter hatred against Khetri. He would not have concealed their lowly Status. It is impossible to say that they all read Tod and so made no inquiries.

The obvious conclusion is that in those days these State Records did not appear to lead to the view, much less carry conviction, that these Thikanedars were only upstart ijaredars.

It has been shown that these Thikanedars stepped into the shoes of Independent Qaimkhanis. It is not suggested that the Qaimkhanis were dependents of the Jaipur State. Therefore the Status of the two ancestors who usurped the lands of the Qaimkhanis was the same as that of their predecessors. The Qaimkhanis however also paid their tribute to Maharajah Jai Singh for some years as the State papers show (P.S. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 A). In these papers they are distinctly called zamindars which was the only word used in those days for Independent Chiefs (See Moreland Appendix H p. 279) and Irvine's Later Mughals Vol: I p. 42.

The reason why after the ijaras the Thikanedars continued to pay their tribute to Jaipur *i., e.,* in the years after

PART III—THE SETTLEMENT OF 1818 A. D.

40 The difficulty of the case arises from the fact that the intermediate history of these Thikanedars has lent colour to their fictitious claims to an independent origin.

1750, was the lump sum assessment by the Mahratta. It may be remembered here that when the Mughal rule was temporarily twice re-established between 1770 and 1790 the Thikanedars and not the supposed owner of this territory, the Jaipur Maharajah, paid the tribute direct to the Emperor.

As has been pointed out, if it was not independent conquest by the two ancestors, Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh, there is no reasonable explanation why they took that part of the cat that pulls the chestnuts out of the fire for Jai Singh. At that period 1730 the Emperor was quite powerful enough to deal with them and destroy them. While in the case of Sardul Singh, he was in a much better position as the Dewan of the Qaimkhani in Jhunjhunu (Tod Vol: III p 1423 and Jaipur State paper P.84) than he would be as a sub ijaredar of Maharajah Jai Singh. This position of Sardul Singh is also supported by the local Histories which further show that Sardul Singh was married to the niece of the Nawab's wife (who was a Rajputni).

PART III
THE SETTLEMENT OF 1818.

40. There is no foundation for the statement that "Sawai Jai Singh's own tenure as ijaredar eventually gave him sovereign Status."

If they were nothing but Ijaredars when Sawai Jaisingh gathered the country under his control, they were certainly more than mere Ijaredars in the opening decades of the 19th century. They were on the way, some of them, to becoming Chiefs or even Kings "on the assumption of a continuance of the period of anarchy". That assumption was not fulfilled, as I have said, for the period of anarchy was abruptly terminated by the British treaty of 1818; but it is possible to argue that, if these Thikanedars were, as the British called them, practically independent Chiefs in the early years of the 19th century, there is some ground for admitting their political semi-independence now, even though in origin they may have been no more than Farmers or Ijaredars Sawai Jaisingh's own tenure as Ijaredar eventually gave him sovereign status His subordinate Ijaredars also acquired, prior to 1818, a political authority subordinate, no doubt, but still with an element of independence Why then should the sovereign status of the former be conceded, while the political semi-independence of the latter is denied ?

By eventually one understands that there was by degrees or at any rate at a leter stage an alteration of Status from ijaredar to Sovereign. How is this to be argued if the basic assessment remained the same all the time? From what acts can one be asked to conclude that Jai Singh showed he had become a Sovereign in these areas? It will be found on looking at the State papers of Panchpana Singhana that there were only temporary deprivations of the management when the tribute had become greatly in arrear, but as soon as this was *recovered, the Thikanedar is always* found reinstated, practically, if not always within one year of his Thikana being made Khalsa. This invariable return of the Thikana to the Thikanedar of the time is an unmistakeable proof of his proprietary position. The extent of his powers is not dealt with by these papers, but that he was much more than an ijaredar is unanswerably shown.

When that is refuted there is no halfway house assigned to the Thikanedars. The Report says subordinate ijaredars; the British Government Records and Historians say Independent Feudatory Chiefs.

The Difficulty of the case which Mr. Wills feels is of his own creation. The writer of the report is the honest

archeologist who has a theory that the Status of the Thikanedars was that of ijaredars and believes he has discovered in the old Jaipur Archives papers that seem to him to completely bear it out. He then comes to the articles of agreement *executed by the Thakurs in the* presence of Sir David Ochterlony in 1818 and puts such a construction on various passages in them and in Sir David's despatches at the time (Appendix H Parts I, II, III) as makes them appear a perfect second line of support of his Theory.

But if he is right, he finds it a remarkable circumstance that with this clear settlement in their hands the British Government, in view of the constant recurrence of disputes between the Thakurs and the State, should have completely forgotten it He notes that Lt.-Col Lockett, the first A G G for Rajputana, in 1831 appears to definitely *know nothing of it and* Col Sutherland, who in 1841 made a specific Report upon the relations between the Feudatory Chiefs and their rulers in Rajputana, makes no reference to such a settlement Nor do the British Official Records which he has studied give the answer to his enigma He is fain to say "I must leave it to the Political Department to solve the problem."

Wisemen and astrologers in an earlier epoch were baffled by the writing on the wall. But if the theory is incorrect and is abandoned, if it is proved that the agreement of 1818 did not deal either with the ancient domains of the Chiefs or their ancient rights, both of which, Sir David specifically assured them at the time, they were to retain, it will not require a Daniel from the Political Department to explain why the Settlement of 1818 was never referred to in 1831 and why all the British Political Records and histories show the Shekhawatti Thikanedars as independent tributary Chiefs.

41. The answer to this question is to be found in the terms of the British Treaty of April 1818 and of the essentially complementary Settlement between the Maharaja and his Thakurs, drawn up in June of the same year. It was the British who finally recognized the sovereign rights of the Maharaja of Jaipur and who refused to concede to the Thikanedars more than the status they had formerly enjoyed according to the "ancient customs of the Raj and the prerogatives of the Maharaja" We must, therefore, examine the circumstances which necessitated the enforcement of such a Settlement within the State and the precise character of what the Government of India called at the time "the fundamental rules" regulating the Thakurs' "future relations with the Raja".

41. It will be very clearly demonstrated that the question, what were their ancient rights and domains, was never considered by Sir David Ochterlony. Nothing in the settlement of June 1818 will help us to elucidate these points. The fundamental Rules which are referred to as set out in the agreement of 1818 do not deal with Status or tell us what their ancient domains were.

It must here be remembered that in the treaty between the British Government and the Jaipur State of 1818, Article 8, which deals with the Status of dependents of the State, says expressly that the Maharajah shall be the Ruler "according to long established

usage." The dependents are not being put in any worse position than they have always held. This has been invariably the basis of the treatment sanctioned by the British Government in the relations between the State and its feudatories. It was clearly impossible at the time to discuss or define the long established usage. It was only necessary to state that it was to continue to govern the relations between *the State and its Feudatories in the* future.

42. I am hampered at this point by my inability to quote from the full British official papers; but the main position of the British Government from 1816 to 1818 is clear enough. They renewed negotiations for an alliance with Jaipur in 1816, in view of the *coming struggle* with the Marathas and the necessity of interposing a barrier between the latter and the Sikhs, but, partly owing to Jaipur's resentment at its abandonment by the British in 1806 and, partly, owing to the complications due to local party politics, little progress could be made Sir Charles Metcalfe, the Resident at Delhi who was entrusted with the negotiations, decided, therefore, on his own responsibility, to bring pressure to bear upon Jaipur by entering into separate conditional agreements with the bigger Thikanedars of Khetri, Umara etc It, then, Jaipur refused the British alliance, it would suffer a serious loss of territory. On the other hand, if it accepted the proposed treaty, it was promised assistance in reducing these and other refractory Thikanedars

42. The Agreement dealt with the restoration of all Jagirs and Farms acquired after the time of the elder Maharajah and it is clearly shown by Sir David's despatch No. 9 para 4 that the intention was to resume the Khalsa lands only but to "Continue every Chief in his ancient rights and domains." So also in his paragraph 10 "That the Maharajah had pledged himself that the Chiefs who were obedient and well disposed should enjoy their ancient rights and domains; and he only required the same for himself". (Appendix II Part I paras 4 and 10) That it only governed Khalsa land is further shown by Sir David's Despatch of 1st July 1818 paragraph 3 in his reply to Bakhtawar Singh about resumption of grants by Maharajahs in Hindustan "That it was particularly common in this Durbar as he must well know;

to a proper degree of subordination. Metcalfe thus describes the position of Khetri and Uniara: "These Chiefs are Dependants and Tributaries, not Subjects. They are independent Rulers in their own territories. They pay tribute or military service or both to the Raja of Jaipur and are entitled to protection. If not protected, their obligations cease and they have a right to carry their tribute and allegiance where they can find security in return." Metcalfe was labouring under the necessity of justifying his negotiations with Estate-holders subordinate to Jaipur, undertaken "without previous instructions"—a circumstance which may possibly have influenced his estimate of the position of these Thikanedars. But his manoeuvre was almost immediately successful (see his despatch of the 29th of January) and the Jaipur Darbar consented to an alliance which was signed on the 2nd of April 1818. It then became incumbent on the British Government, to whom, by the fourth Article of the Treaty of Mandasor, the Maratha supremacy over the Jaipur State had by now been transferred, to implement its promise of territorial consolidation as a necessary corollary to withdrawal of the threat of territorial dismemberment. Moreover the political integrity of the State was needed for other reasons. It was intended to levy a substantial annual tribute and to requisition military assistance from this new ally of the British Government. Accordingly, after the conclusion of the treaty, "the first duty urged on the Maharaja" by Sir David Ochterlony, who had meanwhile succeeded Metcalfe as Resident, was "the resumption of the lands usurped by the nobles and *the reduction of the Nobles to their proper* but in the present instance there was an actual necessity for the measure as nearly all *the Khalsa lands* of the State had got into the hands of Individuals, most of who would urge the same plea"; and again in para 9 Sir David writes that the agreement will enable him "to act without hesitation" or delay "if they attempt to evade the restitution of *the Khalsa lands*". The two despatches thus make it clear that the reference is not to their ancient domains, but only recent acquisitions of Khalsa land in Jagir or farm.

relation of subordination to the Maharaja" (Aitcheson's "Treaties" III page 55). Articles of Agreement were drawn up and signed by every Thakur of note, in which they pledged themselves to obey the Maharaja, to surrender all their recent usurpations and to render service "agreeably to the usages of the Darbar". In return, the Maharaja gave the Thakurs a verbal assurance of his "intention to continue every Chief in the enjoyment of his ancient rights and domains". Ochterlony reported his proceedings at length to the Government of India, enclosing a copy of the Articles of Agreement. In his despatch of the 6th of July, 1818, Lord Hastings' Secretary replied: "The calling on the Thakoors to execute a paper containing the fundamental rules of their future relations with the Rajah, specifying also the relinquishment of their usurped possessions or authority, and the tenor of the articles comprehended in that document generally, are entirely approved by the Governor-General. ......There is now a plain distinct rule founded on unquestionable positions of Justice, involving only points of notorious fact which can easily be established" In view of the importance of this Settlement and of the fact that both the Jaipur State and the Government of India have lost sight of it, I give in Appendix H copies of so much of the original correspondence bearing on the subject as I have been able to secure It will be noticed that, with one exception, each of the ten Articles of Agreement specifically asserts some prerogative of the Darbar.

43 The situation created by the intervention of Sir David Ochterlony the new

43 The Agreement of June 1818 (See Appendix H of the Report) has

Resident, was of a very different character from that envisaged by Sir Charles Metcalfe when describing the ralations of Khetri and Uniara with Jaipur Ochterlony proposed to go behind "the confusion and disorder of the last thirteen years" *(i.e* since the revocation of the first alliance with the British) and to restore the internal situation, both as regards the occupation of land and as regards the relations between the Maharaja and his Thakurs, which had existed in the time of "the elder Maharaja" —Pratapsingh It was intended to "*place the Raja in the state which his ancestors had enjoyed*". It was not the intention of the British to confirm in the Thikanedars' favour the *status quo* as it stood prior to the Treaty of 1818, but to maintain the Thakurs in their "*ancient* rights and domains" and to preserve "the *ancient* customs of the Raj and the prerogatives of the Maharaja" The only land-holding tenures which the Articles of Agreement mention are "Jagirs and Ijaras such as they were in the time of the elder Maharaja". All this proves that the intermediate independence of the Thakurs was not the basis of that Settlement, and this is the only conclusion compatible with the terms of Article 8 of the Treaty itself, which declares that "the Maharaja and his heirs and successors shall remain Absolute Rulers of their Territory and their Dependants [*i e.* Thikanedars] according to long-established usage".

now to be considered in detail. *Clause 2:* There were and are various Jagirs and farms in Jaipur State which are of a date prior to 1803. *Clause 2* of the Agreement sets out only those of a later date must be disposed of according to the will of the Maharajah It does not purport to deal with the "ancient domains" at all. *Clause 3:* Was intended to insure the convicted thief receiving due punishment. In those days and for another 15 years and more, it is stated in official Records, that the Shekhawatti Chiefs were in league with the robbers. Therefore even when convicted the culprit was not subjected to serious punishment. *Clause 4:* Was intended to protect Traders from being plundered when traversing the various jurisdictions with their merchandise. *Clause 5:* Service was to be rendered agreeably to the usage of the Durbar. This proviso carefully restricted service to the old usage. As regards the independent Tributary Chiefs, these Thikanedars, they *have never rendered the* class of service required from the Nobles of Jaipur proper, but have only rendered service on Military expeditions. *Clause 6:* Refers to the service required from Nobles of Jaipur proper. *Clause 7:* This Clause is a translation taken from a Persian translation of the document which Sir David tells us was in the Jaipur language (Appendix H Part I

para 9). Everything depends on the correctness of the translation. The original sentence in the Jaipuri language would be "Qadimi Darbar ke rahdhari Darbar ki rahi." The sentence itself is capable of two meanings.

"The old customs right of the Darbar shall remain with the Darbar," or it may mean "Of old the customs duty is the right of the Darbar and shall remain with the Darbar." That such construction should be given to it which is consistent with the rights that are known to have been exercised from of old by the Darbar is the only correct canon on which the sentence can be understood As the Darbar has never exercised any rights to customs duty in Panchpana Singhana or Seekar and as it was an agreement only covering the restoration of the old rights of the State, it cannot have in the original been a clause investing the Darbar with entirely new rights

It must therefore have had reference to the rights of the Darbar in Jaipur proper, and not in the ilaqa ghair Thikanas. It was a fact that the Jagirdars who were in Jaipur proper had taken to levying rahdari within their areas. *Clause 8:* Refers to Jagirdars and therefore clearly has nothing to do with these Thikanedars who are not Jagirdars nor is it suggested that they are. *Clauses 9 and 10.* have no specific effect.

This exhaustive consideration of the agreement shows that the "intermediate independence of the Chiefs" was never considered and was quite irrelevant to the question that Sir David Ochterlony was present to deal with *viz*: the restoration of encroachments. There is not the least doubt that it was the intention of the British to confirm the feudatory Chiefs in ancient rights and domains "according to long established usage". And the Jaipur State was to remain their absolute Ruler to that extent and no more. The correspondence between Sir Charles Metcalfe and the Rajah Abhai Singh of Khetri at the time of a proposed treaty with him make this very clear. The frequent references to the Status of these Shekhawatti *Chiefs and the extent to which they* can be brought under subjection in the British Records are recurring proofs that their Status was not to be damaged or destroyed.

44 Sir David Ochterlony, while insisting upon this Settlement between the Maharaja and his Thakurs, wisely abstained from any attempt to dictate to the parties the terms of the agreement to be reached between them The orderly character of the Darbar, at which the Settlement was effected, testifies to the seriousness with which it was regarded; and we may well believe that the document then drawn up, on the model of that prepared by Captain Tod for Mewar, really echoed the spirit which underlay the political constitution of the

44. Sir David Ochterlony had only just come to Jaipur in 1818. He could not do otherwise than abstain from any attempt to dictate "the terms of the agreement to be reached between them". He had only a very superficial acquaintance with Jaipur affairs, *vide* his remark to Kunwar Bakhtawar Singh "That I knew the land in general had been first usurped" etc., (Appendix H Part III).

Jaipur State in the 18th century—however incapable were those responsible for drafting the Articles of expressing that spirit in documentary form. The reign of Pratapsingh was deemed to represent the old regime, to which the parties to the Settlement were prepared to return. But it was no part of Ochterlony's duty to define the details of the old-established system He asserted the dominant position of the Maharaja and his ancient prerogatives, and left the responsible officers of the State to maintain them. Unfortunately, no one in the State had the Maharaja's interest at heart. Jagatsingh himself died within six months; the Rani-Regent, who took his place, was clearly incapable of asserting the rights of his infant successor; while the Ministers, who might have expounded the old system, could not afford to do so at the risk of antagonizing the Thakurs on whom they depended for support Nothing, therefore, was likely to come of the Settlement unless the British took steps to enforce it

The agreement was as good as it could be in the circumstances and the only difficulty that now arises is in trying to make it fit to the rights of the feudatory Chiefs instead of leaving it to the encroachments on the Khalsa land, with which it really deals.

For those encroachments there was no occasion for Sir David Ochterlony to "define the details of the old established system".

45 It is a remarkable circumstance that this important Settlement of June, 1818, was soon forgotten by the British Government In view of the constant recurrence, during the subseqent long Minority Administration, of disputes between the Thakurs and the State, one would have expected to find frequent reference to the Articles of Agreement While Sir David Ochterlony was alive they must, of course have been remembered; but he died in 1825; and the creation in 1832 of a separate Agent to the Governor-General for the States of Rajputana seems to have led to neglect of the earlier correspondence of

45 It is not correct to suggest that no one had the Jaipur State interests at heart The Resident with much trouble and persistence drew out a complete list of the encroachments. The question of encroachments was frequently gone into. Sir David is to be found frequently writing about the agreement come to in his presence over these encroachments. They were all settled within 10 years of 1818 and there was no other matter on which the agreement could be referred to

the Resident at Delhi. Lieut-Col. Lockett was the first A. G G for Rajputana; and such extract from his Journal of 1831 as I have been permitted to see definitely indicate that he had no knowledge whatsoever of any official Settlement defining the Thikanedars' relations with the Jaipur darbar (see para 127 below) Nor does Colonel Sutherland, the Governor-General's Agent, refer to any such *Settlement in his* specific report of 1841 upon the relations between Feudatory Chiefs and their Rulers *in Rajputana (see para 56 below)* I must leave it to the Political Department to solve the problem For my part, I can only record that these fundamental Articles of Agreement, an essential corollary to the British Treaty of 1818, appear, so far as I can judge from the papers I have seen, to have been completely lost sight of within a dozen years of their endorsement by the Government of India

46 In Aitcheson's "Treaties" a correct summary of the Settlement is given on page 55 of the latest edition (except that the date is quoted as 1819 instead of 1818) but the documents, reproduced on pages 70 and 71 as the Agreements negotiated in connection with the Settlement through the mediation of Sir David Ochterlony, are those of the 12th of May, 1819, which were drawn up, after Jagatsingh's death, to protect the interests of his infant successor. The real Articles of Agreement, executed on the 21st of June, 1818, in Jagatsingh's presence, which defined in full Darbar the relations between the Ruler and his Nobles, do not appear They have come to light only in the course of this inquiry. This mistake in Aitcheson's "Treaties" has been

Consequently it never is referred to at a later date. The explanation is simple — unless one misapplies the agreement to the Status of the Feudatory Chiefs in their ancient domains.

46. The Summary states, and is accepted as correct, that the first duty urged on the Maharajah after the conclusion of the treaty was the resumption of lands usurped by the nobles, and the reduction of the nobles to their proper relation of subordination to the Maharajah. Through the mediation of Sir David Ochterlony agreements (No. III) were entered into in 1819 similar to those made at Udaipur. "The usurped lands were restored to the Maharajah and the nobles were guaranteed in their legitimate rights and possessions". This is exactly the case made in this reply about this agreement.

referred to in paragragh 61 below. I mention it particularly here, because it was neglect of this fundamental Settlement that made it possible for misapprehensions to arise regarding the constitutional relations between the Maharaja and his Thakurs.

PART IV—TOD'S ANNALS OF AMBER

47. It is appropriate to refer to Tod's Annals of Amber in the section of this report which deals with the Maratha period It is seldom realised that, to use his own words, "this account of the Amber or Jaipur State is nearly what I communicated to the Marquess of Hastings in 1814-15" (*III 1327*). It carries, therefore, none of the authority which attaches to the Annals of Western Rajputana with which, for the last four years of his service, Tod had an intimate official connection. In dealing with Jaipur he had no access to State papers, a circumstance which necessarily detracts from the value of his local history. There is no doubt but that the present misinterpretation of local history is primarily due to the immature conclusions reached by Tod a hundred years ago His Annals have received such wide publicity that they have, as it were, crystallized both public and official opinion in regard to almost every social and historical question in Rajputana His knowledge of local detail, his enthusiastic study of Rajput Institutions, his first-hand acquaintance with the events of the early years of the 19th century and the unusual opportunities he enjoyed of verifying many of the facts which he recorded, have all lent weight to the views which

PART IV.—TODS ANNALS.

47. It is suggested that Tod didn't know the local history of Amber as he did not have access to the State papers. But he must have asked the Jaipur people, from whom he obtained the mass of facts he has connoted and set out, what their views were as to the Chiefs in the Shekhawatti Territory. At least he would have recorded that the Jaipur view was different and what that view was.

The following British Officers had to deal with Jaipur affairs from 1813-1818 :—

British Residents for Delhi and Rajputana Sir Charles Metcalfe 1813-1818: Sir David Ochterlony 1818-1825: *Sir* Charles Metcalfe again in 1825-1826. The local British Officers: *Captain* Stewart from 1821-1824: Major Raper 1824: Captain Low 1825: Mr G. Clerke 1828: Captain Low again 1829. Mr. B. Cavendish 1831 Lt Col A. Lockett 1831-1832 He had been specially employed in Shekhawatti in 1831. (became A. G. G. for Rajputana

the Resident at Delhi Lieut-Col. Lockett was the first A. G. G. for Rajputana; and such extract from his Journal of 1831 as I have been permitted to see definitely indicate that he had no knowledge whatsoever of any official Settlement defining the Thikanedars' relations with the Jaipur darbar (see para: 127 below). Nor does Colonel Sutherland, the Governor-General's Agent, refer to any such Settlement in his specific report of 1841 upon the relations between Feudatory Chiefs and their Rulers in Rajputana (see para: 56 below) I must leave it to the Political Department to solve the problem For my part, I can only record that these fundamental Articles of Agreement, an essential corollary to the British Treaty of 1818, appear, so far as I can judge from the papers I have seen, to have been completely lost sight of within a dozen years of their endorsement by the Government of India

46 In Aitcheson's "Treaties" a correct summary of the Settlement is given on page 55 of the latest edition (except that the date is quoted as 1819 instead of 1818) but the documents, reproduced on pages 70 and 71 as the Agreements negotiated in connection with the Settlement through the mediation of Sir David Ochterlony; are those of the 12th of May, 1819, which were drawn up, after Jagatsingh's death, to protect the interests of his infant successor. The real Articles of Agreement, executed on the 21st of June, 1818, in Jagatsingh's presence, which defined in full Darbar the relations between the Ruler and his Nobles, do not appear They have come to light only in the course of this inquiry. This mistake in Aitcheson's "Treaties" has been

Consequently it never is referred to at a later date. The explanation is simple — unless one misapplies the agreement to the Status of the Feudatory Chiefs in their ancient domains.

46. The Summary states, and is accepted as correct, that the first duty urged on the Maharajah after the conclusion of the treaty was the resumption of lands usurped by the nobles, and the reduction of the nobles to their proper relation of subordination to the Maharajah. Through the mediation of Sir David Ochterlony agreements (No. III) were entered into in 1819 similar to those made at Udaipur. "The usurped lands were restored to the Maharajah and the nobles were guaranteed in their legitimate rights and possessions". This is exactly the case made in this reply about this agreement.

referred to in paragragh 61 below. I mention it particularly here, because it was neglect of this fundamental Settlement that made it possible for misapprehensions to arise regarding the constitutional relations between the Maharaja and his Thakurs.

Part IV—TOD'S ANNALS OF AMBER

47. It is appropriate to refer to Tod's Annals of Amber in the section of this report which deals with the Maratha period It is seldom realised that, to use his own words, "this account of the Amber or Jaipur State is nearly what I communicated to the Marquess of Hastings in 1814-15" (III 1327) It carries, therefore, none of the authority which attaches to the Annals of Western Rajputana with which, for the last four years of his service, Tod had an intimate official connection. In dealing with Jaipur he had no access to State papers, a circumstance which necessarily detracts from the value of his local history. There is no doubt but that the present misinterpretation of local history is primarily due to the immature conclusions reached by Tod a hundred years ago His Annals have received such wide publicity that they have, as it were, crystallized both public and official opinion in regard to almost every social and historical question in Rajputana His knowledge of local detail, his enthusiastic study of Rajput Institutions, his first-hand acquaintance with the events of the early years of the 19th century and the unusual opportunities he enjoyed of verifying many of the facts which he recorded, have all lent weight to the views which

Part IV.—TODS ANNALS.

47. It is suggested that Tod didn't know the local history of Amber as he did not have access to the State papers. But he must have asked the Jaipur people, from whom he obtained the mass of facts he has connoted and set out, what their views were as to the Chiefs in the Shekhawatti Territory. At least he would have recorded that the Jaipur view was different and what that view was.

The following British Officers had to deal with Jaipur affairs from 1813-1818 —

British Residents for Delhi and Rajputana Sir Charles Metcalfe 1813-1818: Sir David Ochterlony 1818-1825: Sir Charles Metcalfe again in 1825-1826. The local British Officers: Captain Stewart from 1821-1824; Major Raper 1824: Captain Low 1825; Mr. G. Clerke 1828 Captain Low again 1829. Mr B Cavendish 1831 Lt. Col. A. Lockett 1831-1832. He had been specially employed in Shekhawatti in 1831, (became A. G G. for Rajputana

he expressed. Yet, as a historian, he had serious limitations The most that I can do, within the narrow compass of an official report, is to suggest certain points of criticism and leave he more detailed account of the separate Thikanas, given in a later section, to confirm the validity of my conclusions,

in 1832): Mr. Blake, I. C. S., 1835, assistant A. G. G. He wrote a full report on the Shekhawatti questions; Colonel Alves A. G. G. 1835-1838. Major Ross 1838. Specially deputed to inquire into the resources of Jaipur State. Lt.-Col. Sutherland A. G. G. 1839-1843. Major Thoresby Political Agent at Jaipur 1839, was previously employed as a Political Agent in Shekhawati.

Major B. Ross 1839:
Major C. Thoresby 1843.
Major H H. Greathead 1844:
Major Ludlow 1848
Captain W. H. Rickards, 1854.
Major C. L. Showers (Offg:) 1855:
Major C. E. Burton 1856.
Captain E. Hardcastle (Offg:) ...1856.
Captain W. Eden . „ ..1859.
Captain Beynon „ ...1859.
Major B. Taylor ...1860.
Major J. C. Brooke ... ..1864.
Captain E.R.C. Bradford
Captain J. Wright ...
Major Bayley... .. .
Major V. Law ....
} These officers officiated at different times *between 1864-1880*
Major W. H. Beynon .... .1880.

Captain Boileau toured through these parts in 1835 and has left a printed Record of his travels.

It is most remarkable that none of these Officers ever heard any contrary

view as to the Status of these Shekhawati Chiefs during the 62 years after the treaty of 1818, a period during which the control of this area constantly came into consideration. The Annals were not printed until 1830.

The Jaipur portion of the Annals was in the Offices of the Government in Calcutta, but no one is likely to have sent for them. They were not commonly read even when they were printed and published. Captain Blake refers to them and differs from them on certain points, so he did not swallow them blindly.

From the fact that these materials were communicated to the Governor General, the Marquess of Hastings, it may be taken that they were compiled with every effort to secure accuracy. We are told by Tod in his introduction "A portion of the materials compiled by Jai Singh of Amber of Jaipur (one of the greatest patrons of science amongst modern Hindu Princes), to illustrate the history of his race fell into my hands"; further on "Amber and its Scion Shaikhawati possess a still greater interest from their contiguity to our frontier. A multitude of singular privileges is attached to Shaikhawati federation, which it behoves the paramount power thoroughly to understand, lest it should be led by false views to pursue a

policy detrimental to them as well as to our selves." (Tod Vol: I Introduction pp. LXII and LXIX).

Of the tribute system in Rajputana Tod records "To preserve their power *the Princes of Rajputana surrendered* a portion of theirs to the Emperors of Delhi. They made a nominal surrender to him of their Kingdoms receiving them back with a Sanad, or grant, renewed on each lapse, thereby acknowledging him as lord paramount".

Tod admittedly came to stay at Jaipur (See paragraph 136 of the Report) His statements as to the Feudatory Chiefs are borne out by the writings of earlier and contemporaneous historians who had no recourse to his work Vide Compton's Military Adventures Appendix, page 356, 357 quoting an article publised in "The World", a Calcutta newspaper, based on a letter *of 1792 from Col: Fremont referring* to Rajah Debi Singh being then at Reengus as "A tributary of the Jaipur Rajah to whom he had refused the established tribute," and saying further down "Rajah Debi Singh has another strong fort called Seekur".

See also a Memorial by Col. W. L. Gardner to his Excellency Lord Lake, Commander in Chief, in October 1803, speaking of his "intimate frienship with Rajah Abhey Singh, a rich and

powerful Chief of Shekhawatee a friendship formed in the field and solemnly pledged by the exchange of turbans".

Lord Elphinstone who led the diplomatic mission to Kabul in 1808 in the introduction to his celebrated work "Account of the Kingdom of Kabul" at page 3 refers to his meeting Raja Ubhee Singh "the principal Chief of the Shekhawat tribe at Singhana". He also visited Jhoonjhoona, which he describes as "a handsome town, with some trees, and gardens which look well in such a desert. Each of the Chiefs, who are five in number, has a castle here; and here they assemble when the public affairs require a council." (ibid 3). He further writes that "The Shekhawattees owe tribute and military service to the Rajah of Jaipur. It was by the assistance of that government that they were enabled, at no very remote period, to wrest their present territory from the Kayamkhanis, a tribe of converted Hindoos". (Ibid p. 5)

Walter Hamilton in his compendious work "Hindoostan" published in 1820, long before Tod's Annals saw the light of publication, regards Shekhawatty as a distinct political and geographical unit just as Jaipur, Marwar or Mewar. Hamilton describes the Shekhawatty Chiefs as "a military class

feudatories to the Raja of Jaipoor." He adds "although nominally the subjects of the Jaypoor Raja, they seldom paid any regard to his mandates". —Hamilton's Hindoostan Vol. I. p. 536.

These views on the Shekhawatti Chiefs of independent writers agree with the more detailed statements of Tod and are not taken from his annals. Their consonance of opinion and the subsequent statements in the British Records to the same effect would present no difficulty if the theory formed in the report is in fact a misconception of the close Moghul authority in Rajputana; of the effect of the taking ijaras by Maharajah Jai Singh II and of the interpretation to be placed on Jaipur State papers referring to these ijaras.

These materials have been welded together by the skilful literary ability of the writer in the face of overwhelming difficulties.

48. Tod suffered from what his Editor, Mr. William Crooke, calls "a decided prejudice against the Kachhwahas of Jaipur". "The faithless Court", "the Jhutha Darbar" and "the Baniya Raj" are expressions which indicate the partisan character of his account. His Editor (Introd: p. xxxvii) ascribes this prejudice in part to Jaipur's 'hesitation in accepting the British alliance"; but fails to observe that these Annals were

48. As Tod was not in service in Jaipur *or in* Shekhawatti he had *no* occasion for prejudice in favour of the State or the Feudatories; but because he has made a few unfavourable comments on the Jaipur regime at times, as any commentator must in the course of his work, he is dubbed a partisan of the Shekhawats. Such comments would be made of some of the Kings

written before that alliance was suggested It is consistent with this prejudice that so much attention should be paid in Tod's pages to the "Shekhawati Confederation". As much space is devoted to Shekhawat history as to the Annals of Amber itself; while his chapter on Sawai Jaisingh is noticeably inadequate Tod's prejudice was directed against the Rajawat, not against the Shekhawat, branch of the Kachhwahas.

of England in an English History and of France in French History.

To this is added the fact that a longer space is devoted to the Shekhawatti country than to Jaipur. In the first place it was a bigger area, and in the second, the author is tracing the history of many different lines in the Shekhawatti federation while there is only one to trace in Jaipur.

These seem very slight and inadequate grounds for rejecting Tod on the ground of partisanship.

49. The Shekhawati Confederation was a product merely of Tod's interpretation of local history and had no corporate existence outside his pages It was Tod who misled the British Government of his day into thinking that, in a Rajput State, the Thakurs, formed, by ancient custom, a Political Order ready, with a little encouragement, to stand forth as a constitutional check upon the autocracy of their sovereign. The Shekhawati Confederation was another picturesque figment of his imagination As early as 1840 we find a Political Agent remarking that "what has been called the Shekhawati Confederacy may be said to be no longer extant". The truth is that it was never extant Its existence is supported by no other evidence than that of Tod, who simply magnified a sentiment of clan cohesion in matters affecting the common interest of the Shekhawats into the semblance of a political institution

49. The Political Agent who in 1840 is quoted as saying—"it is no longer extant" gives by that very sentence indubitable proof that something in the nature of a confederacy did previously exist It is borne out by the short notice of it in Lord Elphinstone's Account of Caubul p 3 and is not contradicted by any writer.

50 Equally open to question is Tod's account of a "treaty between the Shekhawats and Jaipur" (Tod III pp. 1405-6) He gives no date for this treaty, but describes it as the occasion on which the Shekhawats "negotiated the conditions of their future connection with the lord paramount" The treaty, we are told, contained four articles In one "the Court disavowed all pretensions to exact tribute beyond what they (the Shekhawats) had voluntarily stipulated"; another debarred the army of the Maharaja from entering the lands of the Confederation; while a third exempted the Shekhawats from military service, except on receipt of payment for the period of their employment Since Tod himself records a few lines later that the Shekhawats obtained from "the Jhutha Durbar or Lying Court.. not one of the advantages for which they had agreed to serve" it, one finds it difficult to accept this detailed, but uncorroborated, reference as valid evidence of a formal pact between the Jaipur State and the so-called confederation A story in which the simple brave Shekhawat is victimized by the Lying Court suggests its own origin.

50. Tod frequently gives no dates because he often had no material from which he could give exact dates. It is shown by the other facts set out that the treaty was in the time of Maharajah Partap Singh and was come to in order to get Shekhawat assistance against the Haldias. It is just prior to the Capture of Khandela and Rewasa in 1797 by the Jaipur Military Commander Asa Ram (Report paragraph 136) and (Tod Vol: III page 1407).

Except for the breach of the treaty in capturing Khandela, Jaipur State has never sent an army into Shekhawati territory since that treaty. This capture and the failure to return Thui and Gwala are the reasons for Tod calling Jaipur the Jhutha Darbar. Papers among the State Records prove that Thui and Gwala were at one time pergannahs belonging to the Shekhawats.

The last condition that whenever the Shekhawats furnished a contingent for Jaipur expeditions, all their expenses would be paid, has always been observed.

51 A few pages later we read of a new treaty which secured "the renewal of the ancient stipulations [not previously mentioned] regarding the non-interference of the Court in the internal arrangements" of the Thikanas, "so long as the Shekhawats paid the regulated tribute". Here again

51. The later Treaty.

The Agreement of 1818 as to resumption of encroachments was rather a petty affair really as appears from the list of encroachments. Babai is not included in it. It was therefore not

Tod's account is supported by no other evidence; and is altogether contradicted by the terms of the Settlement of 1818. The latter contains no word or hint regarding the limitation of "tribute", the exclusion of the State Forces from the lands of the Confederation or the ancient stipulation regarding non-interference What is stranger still, Tod, who might have been expected to know of this important Settlement, since he supplied the model from which it was drafted (see App: H Pt I), makes no mention of it whatsoever in his Annals of Amber, though he devotes a whole chapter to the year 1818-19. The imperfect character of Tod's history is emphasized by the prominence he thus gives to dubious treaties which purport to favour the Shekhawats, in contrast with his silence regarding an Agreement in favour of the State, declared at the time by the Government of India to constitute the fundamental rules regarding the Thakurs' future relations with their Maharaja.

considered as in that category in those days when the encroachments were being seriously examined.

51 A. There is no evidence of any interference in the internal arrangements of the "Thikanas up to the time when Tod wrote, 1814-1815. Assuming that he might have added to his annals a reference to the Agreement of 1818; but seeing that it does not evidence any interference with internal arrangements of the Thikanas, it would not have been relevant. It refers as already pointed out, to the return of such Jagirs and farms as had been obtained later than 1803 and to Jaipur State being entitled to road customs duties in Jaipur proper. The Nobles further agree not to harbour thieves and robbers and to protect merchants while in their jurisdictions. Nothing in the Agreement attempts to interfere with the control of the internal arrangements in these Thikanas.

51 B The small points which are specifically dealt with by the 1818 Agreement would not attract the attention of an author when adding a passage on the constitutional question of Custom of succession to a State in Rajputana. That, apparently, was the only material addition to what he had communicated to the Marquess of Hastings in 1814-1815 (See Tod Vol: III p 1327 footnote).

52. *To quote Tod's Editor once more:* "Tod reposed undue confidence in the epics and ballads composed by the poet Chand and other tribal bards ... The poet may occasionally record facts of value; but, in his zeal for the honour of the tribe he represents, he is tempted to exaggerate victories and minimize defeats. This is a danger to which Indian poets are particularly exposed. Their trade is one of fulsome adulation; and, in a state of society like that of the Rajputs, where tribal and, personal jealousies flourish, the temptation to give a false colouring to history is great" (Tod Introd page xxx) This applies with particular appositeness to the Annals of Amber A great part of this portion of Tod's work is little more than a lengthy but uncritical transcription from local annalists whose mutual inconsistencies Tod has not troubled to remove He wholly disregards, in common with subsequent English writers, the fundamental fact of effective Mogul domination in the 16th and 17th centuries; and, therefore, visualizes throughout his story a state of society which gave free play to the swords of practically independent Chieftains, operating in a field where no external political authority existed. This may have been true of early times; it was true of the time when Tod was writing, for the Jaipur State was on the verge of dissolution and the ability of the local Shekhawat Chieftains to defy the State's authority obscured the normal situation; but it was in no way appropriate to the conditions which prevailed under the four great Mogul Emperors, or even up to the closing decade of the 18th century.

52. *If Tod reposed undue confidence* in the materials at his disposal the Report quoting him at every page has been unable to show any authority to *contradict him. He ignores, it is said;* the fundamental facts of "Effective Moghul domination", "in common with subsequent English writers." The fact is *that* all *writers state there was no such* close Moghul control as the Report has inferred and made the basis of its political disquisition.

If there was no such control in Chiefs' territory, and particularly in such territory in Rajputana, the groundwork of the Report for Maharajah Jai Singh's territorial acquisitions by virtue of his revenue collecting ijaras is demolished, the theory being that Jai Singh made individual collection from the peasants *as it was close Moghul Control. If,* however, it was Chiefs' territory, there would be no contact with the peasantry and hence no possession but only realisation of tribute.

One must again remember the terrain. A very large area sparsely inhabited at points far apart covering 4,000 or 5,000 square miles. *Did the Moghul ever go* there? Have we any evidence that the Emperors ever sent any army there except in 1730 when the Shekhawattee Chiefs *ousted the Qaimkhanis and de-*feated the Moghul force. No army ever

It is this defect in his historical setting, excusable no doubt in the circumstances in which Tod wrote, that vitiates the general picture he has painted.

53 Tod is the protagonist of the school which treats the political structure of the Jaipur State as resting, so far as its major Thikanas are concerned, upon a federal basis He believed that conquest by the sword was in every case the foundation of the rights of these Thikanedars; and, since he ascribed to them the character of independent Chiefs, he could only suppose that they were incorporated in that State by some sort of political negotiation. Of Sawai Jaisingh's extension of his territories by means of the Farming System neither Tod nor any other subsequent writer has had the least conception All, therefore, have been equally at fault in their attempts to analyze the character of the tie which links his subordinate Estate-holders with the Ruler of Jaipur.

came to avenge defeat or reinstate the Qaimkhanis. Where do we get even this much information except from the Bards and a chance reference to the facts in a Jaipur State paper (S. 40)?

53. Tod's Statement of conquest of the territory by the sword is exactly borne out by this very State paper. Of Sawai Jai Singh's improvement of the State, of his multifarious activities and interests, Tod gives every indication, but of the extension of his territories, he, certainly, and all subsequent historians and Political Records, have no conception. This does not daunt the author of the Report.

Section IV—The BRITISH PERIOD

PART I—BRITISH OFFICIAL VIEW OF THIKANEDARS' STATUS

54. For the British period I need not provide an outline of local history. This can be found for pre-Mutiny days in the "Political History of the State of Jeypoor" by Colonel Broke, a former Political Agent, published as a selection from the Records of the Government of India in 1868 "A Brief History of Jaipur", by Thakur Fatehsingh Champawat, carries the narrative of events down to 1882, while for more recent years there are the usual Gazetteers I shall confine myself to an attempt to indicate, in a general way, the direct and indirect effects of the British connection upon the Thikanedars who come within the purview of this report I shall deal, first, with the British official view regarding their origin and status, then with the influence of a long minority administration upon their position, and, finally, with the curtailment of their internal autonomy necessitated by modern administrative standards

Section IV

THE BRITISH PERIOD.

54. For the British Official view, which the report proposes to first deal with, it is as well to bring to notice at the outset that there has never been any variation in the finding of every officer who had to deal with the Shekhawats that their Status is that of *Independent Chieftains who pay tribute to* Jaipur and are liable to some military service which is not well defined.

This view was first stated by Mr. Metcalfe in 1816 in his reports to the Governor-General and thereafter consistently repeated in different language by Officials and historians alike. This is *too important* to be got over by any such explanation as the Report offers. For these opinions were not formed in haste, nor were they formed without means of inquiry. Nor can it be said that they were the result of prejudice or carelessness. Their only flaw is that they differ from the theory of the Report. That is all. Whether they were feudatories or tributaries; whether they attained their lands by Clan conquest or were allodial proprietors; has not been uniformly stated. This is not unnatural, because the evidence on these points would be difficult to obtain and probably not uniform. The broad

question, however, whether they were independent Chiefs who were liable to make a fixed payment, or were only sublessees who had in recent years—since 1803—tried to take up the unfounded Status of independent Chiefs, was too distinct to have led to there being only one pronouncement on it, unless it was beyond challenge.

With respect to the minority administration: it is to be pointed out that very early—in 1821—the misrule of the State led to a permanent British Resident, Captain Stuart, and this has given us very early knowledge about the various factions, the leading Chieftains, their rights, their usurpations, the position of the Chieftains in Shekhawatti, and what rights they had. Could they be evicted? How could they be made to keep order in their territories?

Then the Records disclose that special British officers were sent to the Shekhawatti Territory to discover and report on conditions there and as to what measures could best be taken in that area. Further records show the officers who were sent and the reports they made. It was a very protracted business and discloses a very careful inquiry into the position of the Chiefs and of the pursuits of the inhabitants. The Jaipur Officials are in constant

touch with these officers and inquiries must have been made from them all the time. Even if this were not done, the Jaipur Ministers and their Agents would have pointed out that these Chiefs had no real Status—if that had been the fact. That nothing of this sort was ever said is irrefutable proof that they had the Status that the British Officials ascribe to them.

55 In 1841 Colonel Sutherland, the Agent to the Governor-General, reported at length upon "the relations in which the Feudatory and Tributary Chiefs of Rajputana originally stood towards their Sovereigns" and "upon the changes which have taken place in those relations through the introduction of our Paramount Power" By this time the Jaipur Settlement of 1818 had been forgotten ; and Tod's Annals held the field The Government of India urged that "former usage should be consulted and adhered to", but, so far as Jaipur was concerned, when the Articles of Agreement themselves were overlooked, it was unlikely that any other source of information regarding former usage would be made available Had the Political Officers had access to the Settlement of 1818, they might have noticed that "Jagirs and Farms such, as they were in the time of the elder Maharaja" were the only land-tenures to which that document refers As it was, Tod's "Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan", followed in 1839 by Elphinstone's famous "History of India", set the seal, so to speak, upon the prevalent opinion that the Rajput territorial system was one

55. In reference to Colonel Sutherland's report it must be noticed that it was to embrace a very large area with many varieties of feudatory and Tributary Chiefs. It was to cover the whole of Rajputana Still, the report is quite obviously entirely independent of Tod's Annals and the mere statement that Tod's Annals "held the field" cannot reduce the report to a réchauffée of the work of that painstaking chronicler.

But, when it comes to ringing the changes on the Settlement of 1818 once *more, one is compelled to reiterate the* outstanding facts that Sir David Ochterlony, prior to that June meeting, desired (as his despatch Part I, paras 4 and 10, Appendix II, shows) that "The Maharajah should declare his intention to continue every Chief in his ancient rights and domains" and Sir David personally told them "That the Maharajah had pledged himself that the Chiefs who were obedient and well

which it was "impossible not to call feudal". disposed should enjoy their ancient rights and domains".

Naively, but very correctly, it is noted of the 1818 Agreement that Jagirs and farms "were the only land tenures to which that document refers."

Yet this does not in the least disclose to the writer of the report that all other tenures were left untouched, even with the despatches to help him stating that the nobles were guaranteed all their ancient rights and domains. What domains, if they were all mere sublessees? Or, if these Thikanedars, at any rate, were sublessees, whatever the others were, Sir David Ochterlony was the Political Resident, Delhi and Rajputana area 1818-1825, and while living at Delhi was for months together at Jaipur, (Brooke's Political History p. 21), and couldn't have either forgotten the Agreement or the tenures which it covered. Why did not he try and deal with them as such? The improvement of the Revenue, the restoration of areas usurped were the particular purposes for which Captain Stewart had been sent to Jaipur in 1821. He corresponds regularly with Sir David about these matters. He sends a list of areas to be recovered.

How then did Sir David and Captain Stewart fail to advert to the right of the Jaipur State to all these territories

and to suggest enhancement of the revenue assessed on them? It is too patent that this is only consistent with the fact that these huge areas were not liable to any such treatment and were never considered either Jagirs or farms (ijaras) by any British or Indian authority in the very times when, if ever, this view might have been adopted, that is, during the years that Sir David was the Political Officer in charge of the Rajputana States and in close contact with the resident who was sent to Jaipur at his own suggestion. With these cogent facts it is fantastic to treat the agreement as making these Thikanedars out as only holding Jagirs and Farms. Those Jagirs and Farms which were liable to resumption were being dealt with by Captain Stewart; and Sir David Ochterlony frequently in that connection refers to the Agreement, executed in his presence as he states. But, manifestly, if it only dealt with such Jagirs and Farms as were liable to resumption and these had been resumed by 1825, there was nothing further to look at in the Agreement, qua lands. It, being functus officio, was laid to rest. As to the customs duties, which it also dealt with: These were looked into and as it referred to the customs duties as of old, it only concerned Jaipur proper and not the ilaqa ghair, where the Jaipur State never levied customs. For the Jaipur State

56 Colonel Sutherland wrote: "There can be no doubt that the Chiefs hold their lands on Military Tenure: and that they are bound to furnish stipulated quotas of troops for stipulated period of yearly service, and to give their personal attendance, whenever required by the Sovereign, in times of peace .....and that the Chiefs are bound to fixed yearly payments of Mamla or Tribute Fulfilling these obligations, those Chiefs hold their possessions on conditions as well understood and defined as the Sovereign holds his own Many of them are coevel with the establishment of the Sovereignties; and their lands are, probably, the share of the conquest which fell to the Chiefs. These possessions are, of course, hereditary but not saleable, and descend to collateral heirs, either through adoption or natural succession, on the payment of a fine or *nazarana* to the Crown.. ...In times of war or danger the Chiefs are, of course, bound to join the Standard of their Sovereign with their whole following, to serve as long as danger may threaten and to contribute pecuniary assistance, additional to their ordinary payments in tribute according to the exigencies of the occasion —of which, however, they are, at least, as much the judges as the Sovereign himself". Referring, in particular, to "the position in which the Shekhawati Tributaries or Feudatories stand to their paramount State of

elaborate customs duty arrangements were set out by the Political Officer of the day. If copies of the British Records are obtained--application for them has been made—they will be put up with or subsequent to this Reply.

56. It is here to be pointed out that from of old these Chiefs are spoken of by Colonel Sutherland as bound in times of War or danger to join the standard of their Sovereign with their whole following and to serve as long as danger may threaten.

How did mere sublessees become liable to such military sevice? How could they get up a following?

Jaipur", Colonel Sutherland wrote: "It appears to me that Jaipur stands towards these petty States in the very same position in which as the paramount power in India, we stand towards Jaipur itself"; and he approved of his Political Agent Major Thoresby's opinion that 'if they paid their tribute regularly and preserved peace and good order within their several jurisdictions Jaipur would have little claim to interfere in their affairs"

57 Major Thoresby had reported to Colonel Sutherland that "the Shekhawati Chiefs are more of Tributaries than Feudatories of the Jeypore State, to which they owe no kind of service" Such freedom from liability for military service was inconsistent with the ordinary feudal conception of their origin and status; but this difficulty was conveniently solved by applying to these Thikanas the epithet "allodial" (from "allodium", meaning free ownership) borrowed, through Tod, from mediaeval Europe Colonel Brooke, accordingly, in his History of Jaipur, published in 1868, propounded a classification of the local land-tenures in which, under the second head, appear "Allodial Estates, conquered by the ancestors of the owner, or possessed by them anterior to the conquest of the country by the reigning family, or not granted by the State, or who have voluntarily sought the protection of Jaipur This class includes the Shekhawats generally, with Sikar, Khetri, Umara etc" (Brooke p 11) Further official confirmation of this classification is provided by its reproduction in paragraph 196 of the Review by the Agent to the Governor-General for

57. There was evidently some uncertainly whether these Chiefs had gone on Military service of their own free will and accord or under some duty to do so. If of their own accord, then it was a tributary tenure; if by a condition of the tenure, then it was feudatory. A treaty to this effect is set out as having been made (Tod Vol: III pp. 1405, 1406). Probably it was all unwritten and a matter of construction of their actions on previous occasions. The ancestors of these Thikanedars had developed a concerted plan of action in 1730, 1731, which had ended in their securing a very large territory, and for its conquest and retention they sought and obtained the influence of Maharajah Jai Singh. He, it seems, was instrumental in getting them big loans from the Bankers of Jaipur and in keeping off reprisals from the Delhi Emperor's forces. This is apparent from the Seekar State papers, S. 40 and some subsequent ones.

Rajputana on the Administration Reports for 1865-66 and 1866-67.

58 The whole theoretical position was revised in 1879, when the first Rajputana Gazetteer was published under the editorship of Sir Alfred Lyall Lyall now discarded the epithets feudal and allodial, urging that "the clan fraternity" provided the tie between the Ruler and his Chiefs in a Rajput State — the Chiefs holding their lands "not originally by grant from the Sovereign or upon a feudal system. but by right of kinship with, and descent from. the original stock or stocks which first conquered and settled as a dominant clan in the country" (R G II page 141). He wrote "The tenure of the great clansmen involves military service and payment of financial aids, but its source is to be found in the original clan occupation of the lands and in the privileges of kinship and priority of descent from the original occupants or conquerors The subordinate Chiefs really claim to be coparceners with the Rulers in their right to dominion over the soil and to the fruits of it" (R G I 59 - 60 He referred to the Thakurs of Shekhawati as a "sept", 'the descendants of a son of an ancient Chief who *went forth and conquered this* tract on his own score and private venture" (Lyall p 253), and called the Rao Raja of Sikar one of those minor Chiefs "who claim some kind of privileged status and separate jurisdiction under the ruling power of the State. by virtue of having descended from a distant stock or having originally conquered and maintained their lands without aid or commission from the State Ruler but on their own score

58. The Report very rightly grasps the fact in this paragraph that inspite of the substitution of a tribal basis for feudal and allodial hypotheses no modification of consequence was made in the actual definition of the Thikanedars' tenures in Jaipur.

The Seekar papers S. 40 and others show pretty much what is set out in the Rajputana Gazetteer of 1879, because these papers show that the ancestors began their venture under the aegis and protection of Maharajah Jai Singh II. The same view is to be found in Elphinstone's "Account of the Kingdom of Caubul" p. 5 and Hamilton's Description of Hindostan Vol: I. p. 536 Lt. Col. Lockett's journal and Report on Shekhawattee 1831, *page 90*

and vanture" (R. G. Vol: I 55-6). But, in spite of this substitution of a tribal basis for feudal and allodial hypotheses, no modification of consequence was made in the actual definition of the Thikanedars' tenures in Jaipur. The freedom of the Shekhawats and others from liability for military service was not explained; and Colonel Brooke's classification of 1868 was reproduced in the Gazetteer of 1879 (Vol: II p. 141) "with some slight alteration" only — the second head of the revised classification (from which the word "allodial" was omitted) comprising "Estates either conquered or possessed by the ancestors of the present holders prior to the conquest of Jaipur by the reigning family, including such Chiefships as Sikar, Khetri, Umara and others" As a long extract from Sir Alfred Lyall's contribution to the Rajputana Gazetteer of 1879 forms the Introduction to the sixth edition (1931) of the Offiical List of "Ruling Princes, Chiefs and Leading Personages" for Rajputana and Ajmer, we may safely assume that kinship and clan occupation are still regarded by the Government of India as providing in Jaipur, as in other leading Rajput States, the source of the territorial rights and special powers of the *great Thikanedars and the key to their* relation with the Maharaja.

59 I need not write at length to challenge this British official view. The evidence collected for the purpose of the present inquiry shows that it is entirely without authority, so far as the Thikanedars of the Jaipur State are concerned. Not one of the conditions set forth by Colonel Brooke (see paragraph 57 above) as

59. Seekar with reference to its modern area and Khetri as a part of Jhunjhunu came into existence by conquest in 1731.

Part of Seekar, the southern part, belongs to the family from a much older time, from the days of Akbar

characteristic of his "Allodial Estates" is appropriate to Sikar, Khetri or Uniara. They were not conquered by the ancestors of the owner"; nor were they "not granted by the State." Their first holders entered them as Sawai Jaisingh's lessees, and neither "voluntarily sought the protection of Jaipur" nor did they possess their estates "anterior to the conquest of the country by the reigning family". To describe these Thikanas (as they are described in the Rajputana Gazetteer of 1879) as Estates "either conquered or possessed by the ancestors of the present holders prior to the conquest of Jaipur by the reigning family" is to provide them with an historical background which is wholy incorrect The publications of the Government of India treat these Estates as the product of an indigenous customary system which developed during a long period of unrecorded tribal history. On the other hand the numerous State documents which define the tenures and assessments of the earlier holders are proof conclusive both of their modern origin and of their establishment not by customary "status" but by ordinary "contract" I shall not labour the point further. If the evidence of the old State Papers is insufficient to satisfy the reader that this conclusion is correct, no other argument is likely to convince him.

when he granted Kasli to their ancestor Rao Tirinal. But these Northern areas were conquered in 1730 by the ancestors Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh, as has been stated before on the basis of State paper S. 40 and the historical authors already quoted. They were not granted by Jaipur State. The report itself denies any grant by calling them only lessees still and the reply does not suggest any grant. The State decuments prove that the two families, though they fail to pay the tribute and would be dismissed for good and all if only sublessees, are never ousted. Such a procedure would have been very difficult, if not impossible. A land proprietor has too many roots in the soil. But, temporarily, he can be deprived of the management of his estate to pay up debts. The necessity for such action is recognised as inevitable. A permanent eviction on the other hand would lead to the peasantry siding with the evicted Chief, who would turn outlaw. Cultivation would stop; collections of revenue would come to an end. The expenses of a force sent out to restore order would be very high and might be very prolonged. From knowledge of these consequences no one would attempt a permanent eviction.

The State documents require careful interpretation and understanding. Properly

considered they do not lead to the conclusion that these Thikanedars were only sublessees. It must be remembered that the landed proprietor collected the mamla or tribute along with his rents. He never paid out of his privy purse. He therefore was the best person to take a contract of collecting and paying it over to the man who had the right to it, either the Jagirdar or, if given out by him in farm, the farmer. The fact then that the landed proprietor undertakes to collect and pay the tribute does not in any way show that he is only a sub-lessee. This fact has been entirely lost sight of by the Report.

If the old State papers are interpreted in this way *they will clash with all* histories, Records and traditions. The only thing left is the bold step of saying all these writings are wrong but the interpretation of the State papers is right.

60 One indirect consequence of the British official estimate of the origin and status of the Jaipur Thikanedars may be noticed here. They were, and still are, deemed to be territorial *Chiefs* — feudal, allodial or tribal — who share the Maharaja's right to dominion over the soil. Their *net* payments are, therefore, treated as "tribute" — a term which has been applied to them for a hundred years. In 1831 Colonel Lockett noticed the distinction between the gross figures of

60. These tributes that are paid to this day have their origin in the right to protection which has now gone out of the hands of the State into the hands of the British Government. The prospective agreement with the Rajah of Khetri which Mr. Metcalfe had put forward was in return for the protection of the British Government. Were it not for Clause

demand and the net payments of the individual Thikanedars in Panchpana-Singhana, but was content to observe that the "Tribute", fixed at the time when the Shekhawats entered the tract, "continues unaltered"—without realizing that it was, of course, only the gross figures of demand that could be so described. Later authorities seem to have followed the simple dictum of Colonel Sutherland in 1841 regarding Rajputana in general (quoted in paragraph 56 above) that "the Chiefs are bound to fixed yearly payments of Mamla or Tribute" There is no doubt but that the British treatment of the Jaipur Thikanedars as "Tribute paying Chiefships", has resulted in the stabilization of their net payments; but, in my opemon, such stability, arising from the weakness of the State and the misundetstanding of the British, cannot be regarded as more than a conventional stability I have been unable to trace any valid authority for regarding the net payments as permanently fixed; and, in the absence of such authority, I see no reason why the State should now feel bound to accept them as such The gross assessments may be regarded as permanently fixed; but it would be unfair to the State to assume that all the multifarious additions and deductions, granted at different times and for different reasons which have produced the net assessment must necessarily enjoy the same sacrosanct character (see also paragraph 166 below)

8 in the treaty with Jaipur that the Maharajah and his heirs were to remain absolute rulers of their dependents according to long-established usage, the tribute would no longer be leviable. It is, however, under that clause payable according to long-established usage. There is therefore neither right nor equity in the suggestion of the Report that the present payment is open to enhancement owing to the misunderstanding of the British.

Part II—THE THIKANEDARS AND THE MINORITY ADMINISTRATION 1818-1851 A. D.

61. Maharaja Jagatsingh died in December 1818 In April of the following year a posthumous child was born to him whose mother, the Bhatianiji Rani, was, in accordance with custom, appointed as Regent on the child's behalf. The British Government were naturally concerned at *the prospect of a long minority; and, in* order to safeguard both the interests of the minor Ruler and their own claims upon the State for tribute and military service, they required from all the leading Thakurs an undertaking not to encroach, as they had done in the past, upon the crown-lands (khalsa) of the State during the young Maharaja's nonage [The documents executed in this connection, and printed as No III on pages 70 and 71 of Volume III of the latest edition of Aitcheson's "Treaties", are those which have, since that work was first published, been mistaken for the Settlement of the previous year between Maharajah Jagatsingh and his Thakurs] At the same time the numerous usurpations of the Thakurs during Jagatsingh's reign were resumed The most notorious of these were the forcible appropriation of Babai by Raja Abhaisingh of Khetri and of Khandela by Rao Raja Lachhmansingh of Sikar Both these Thikanedars obtained, on a high assessment, a temporary Ijara of the tracts they had misappropriated; but, whereas the Rao Raja of Sikar was ousted finally from Khandela in 1824, the Raja of Khetri has succeeded in retaining Babai ever since

Part II. — The THIKANEDARS and the MINORITY ADMINISTRATION.

61. Reference is made herein to the "forcible appropriation of Babai by Rajah Abhey Singh of Khetri". There is not one line of evidence for this very downright Statement.

Sir David Ochterlony had only very vague and superficial acquaintance with the subject of the usurpations. He writes to the Secretary to Government from Jaipoor on the 9th June 1818, that he has suggested to the Maharajah to hold an assembly of the Nobles.

"I propose to discuss the subjects of their usurpation of the Khalsa lands and as there is not a doubt of the fact and I believe little doubt that they have not a plea to urge in Justification excepting that they took only what would otherwise have been taken by Meer Khan, I should hope that they will yield to the will of the Raja who adverting to the State of his country appears not to wish to take any retrospective measure regarding collections, but merely to insist on the restoration of what they cannot deny to be his right. It is possible however that the state of this Durbar for a long time past has admitted of this undue appropriation of the "Crown

Lands" *and after the seizure has been* actually made, Influence and corruption have been successfully employed to obtain Grants or Sunnads for lands in reality obtained by Force."

62. The British Government was anxious to implement the pledges it had given to restore the position of the Maharaja and the integrity of his State; but the Maharaja was an infant, and the Rani-mother, who was, of course, strictly secluded within the palace, was under the influence of an able but unscrupulous Baniya, named Jhutharam Sanghi, and of two slave-girls, of whom Rupa Bararan was the more notorious. Jhutharam had a rival for political power in Rawal Bairisal of Samod, one of the leading nobles of the State who was favoured by the British; but this only stimulated endless intrigue and fierce party strife. The rival factions at headquarters needed the Thakur's support, and competition for that support made it impossible for any Minister to assert the State's authority over them, even assuming that he wished to do so. The hope of any real improvement from within Jaipur resulting from the Treaty and Settlement of *1818* was quickly dissipated. The British, at first, left the State to work out its own system of internal administration, but this detachment proved so disastrous that in *1821* Captain Stewart was sent to Jaipur as the first Political Agent.

62. It is as well to know how Jhutha Ram viewed the Shekhawattee Chiefs. He had a strong aversion for them and for Khetri a bitter hatred. He was not anxious to get their support. He marched an army against them, as Colonel Lockett tells us. No explanation applicable to Rawal Bairi Sal as wanting their support can account for the failure of Jhutha Ram to assign them the lowly status which is so *confidently stated* as *proved* from the Jaipur papers.

63. Colonel Brooke (p. 18) refers to "our ignorance of the relations subsisting between the component parts of a Rajput State, which we supposed had progressed

63. The paragraph quotes Col: Brooke as recording the power of the great tributaries. "It may be supposed

beyond the feudal epoch and had verged, or required little at our hands to cause it to verge, towards a constitutional monarchy." This mistaken supposition was, of course, the product of Tod's writings, which led the British to believe that the general body of Thakurs formed a recognised Poitical Order: but it served to increase the consequence of the major Thikanedars, who found themselves consulted by the British Government on many important matters relating to the administration of the State. Thus, in 'Sketches of the Relations with the different Native States', published in 1837, Captain Sutherland tells us that "In 1826, when the young Raja attained his seventh year, it became a question with some of the principal Thakurs whether according to former usage, it was not necessary to remove him from the female apartments and to place him under the guardianship of certain Nobles who should become a Council of Regency during the remaining years of the minority. Rawal Bairisal was at the head of the Chiefs who supported these views and they were desired by the British Government to assemble at the Capital for the purpose of discussing these points. They assembled, accordingly, in Parliament of Jaipur.. .. Such an assemblage of Chiefs, seventy-three in number, for a peaceable and legitimate object, was certainly one of the most interesting spectacles ever witnessed in Rajputana . ...Eventually, the votes were in favour of the Queen-mother to the exclusion of the Council of Thakurs. The Chief who had opposed her views returned defeated to their respective homes, requiring and receiving in some shape the guarantee of the British Government for their in a community of nobles, most of them living at a distance from Court, having their own possessions and followers held almost independent of the throne, that there must be a power of combining and of regulating the measures of their Government . . . .and there is a power amongst them which *has preserved their order against the encroachments of either the throne or the people.*"

Such a position must have been challenged and must have led to discussion if not admitted on all hands. *There would be a fair statement of the opposite view if there had been* any. There is, however, no trace of the sublessee Status in any British record or historical book. To an unprejudiced observer or to one not anxious to fasten a theory on to the facts in the face of the evidence, these passages would be convincing proof that the Thikanedars were Independent Chiefs *paying tribute for* protection *and rendering Military Service in time* of need.

future safety, in consequence of the part they had taken against the Regent-mother". Captain Sutherland continues: "This guarantee has, unfortunately, been appealed to too often in the subsequent disputes of the Thakurs with the head of their government, whatever the nature of these disputes There is a sort of federal government in most of the States of Rajputana: and this is more apparent in Jaipur than in any of the other States. It may be supposed, in a community of Nobles, most of them living at a distance from Court, having their own possessions and followers, held almost independent of the throne, that there must be a power of combining and of regulating the measures of their government When the regular army of the State becomes more powerful than their united forces, they are necessarily controlled; but during a minority, or under a weak government which had no foreign support, their influence, it may be supposed, would prevail, and there is a power amongst them which has preserved their Order against the encroachments of either the Throne or the People "

64 The confused politics at headquarters, with a minor Prince, a *pardanashin* Regent and self-seeking Ministers, still further favoured the independence of the local Thakur leaders, and it was not long before matters came to a head in Shekhawati The mass of the Shekhawats, we read, 'had little to lose from the frowns of the Court, whilst the more unprincipled the ministers, the more likely were they to connive at the acts of plunder perpetrated, and the arbitrary exactions levied, by the Shekhawats on

64. But for the minority administrations and the misrule of the Regency there would never have arisen the opportunity or occasion for British Officers to make such frequent and painstaking studies of the various rights of the parties in the State of Jaipur This fact has led to the forming and setting out of an independent truthful record that cannot be gainsayed The next hundred and twenty years never

unoffending traders. The Jaipur Government was in the habit of taking a *chauth* (fourth part) of such gains from those holding fortresses in Shekhawati; and was, in consequence, induced to screen the mode of life pursued by these marauding Chieftains. The country from these causes became more and more disturbed, till it was deemed advisable to send an officer on a special mission to report on the best mode of stopping these excesses" (Brooke page 31) Lieut: Col: Lockett, who was selected for this duty and who was in 1832 appointed as the first incumbent of the new post of Agent to the Governor-General for the States of Rajputana, made a tour through the country in 1831: and, as a result of his report, a Brigade of British troops was despatched to dismantle the local fortresses. At the same time, the administration of Shekhawati was taken over by the British: an annual "fauj kharch" of over half a lakh of rupees was imposed on the local leaders for the maintenance of a cavalry contingent; and the Officer Commanding the Shekhawati Brigade was invested with general magisterial powers. This firm action had an immediate effect, and in 1836-7 the district was restored without reservation to the Jaipur Government.

65 Meanwhile the young Maharaja Jaisingh III, who would have attained his majority in 1837, died suddenly in 1835 – in circumstances which strongly suggested that he had been poisoned — leaving Ramsingh, a two-year-old child, to succeed him. Jhutharam is generally credited with the crime of murdering his young master, with the object of extending

challenge the record; Rulers who obtain majority never challenge the Record. It is said they did not know that complete proof existed in their records. But if it is a mistaken view of the position then they knew only *too well that there* could be nothing in their records. If they knew to the contrary, can one believe they never thought of setting on clerks and officials to investigate the records?

Col: Lockett's appointment and his investigations on the spot are available to us, but we are to be diverted from giving this officer's long experience and recorded opinions any value by a vague suggestion that he was closely watched (See Report ¶ 127). Was he not as closely watched by Jhutha Ram, see Colonel Lockett's Journal pp. 77-100.

65. This is a favourable opportunity for collecting the views of the British Officers who had occasion to deal with Shekhawatti during the minority period and to set them out chronologically.

The first Officer is Mr. C. T. Metcalfe—afterwards Lord Metcalfe—whose

the minority administration. In this object he succeeded; but a savage assault on the Agent to the Governor-General in the same year and the murder of his Assistant, Mr. Blake, led to Jhutharam's incarceration and to a more vigorous British intervention at the headquarters of the State. Jhutharam's place was taken by Rawal Sheosingh, the son of Rawal Bairisal, but in 1839 the Rani-Regent, mother to Ramsingh, was excluded from power altogether, and a Council of Regency was formed, a system of administration which continued until the Maharaja came of age in 1851

integrity and painstaking investigation into all matters which were in his charge are both well known and ably recorded in Kay's Life of Lord Metcalfe. It is not a little astounding therefore to find it stated in S 42 of the Report, as discrediting the value of his views, that "Metcalfe was labouring under the necessity of justifying his negotiations with Estate holders subordinate to Jaipur, undertaken without previous instruction — a circumstance which may possibly have influenced his estimate of the position of these Thikanedars." Once a theory has obtained control of an author's intellect it brings him even to this pass.

It is impossible to conceive that Metcalfe had not carefully assured himself, by due inquiries from the Jaipur Vakils and delegates and other sources, as to the Status of these Tributary Chiefs before he wrote to The Governor General. One cannot suggest that he gave them this Status in order to put a better appearance on his own acts in negotiating with such a Chief.

The views of these officers so far as copies have been obtained from the State Record Office and other sources enable us to produce them are now set out.

SIR CHARLES METCALFE, in his despatch to the Secretary to the Governor-General dated the 29th June, 1818, (See Secret Consultation dated the 28th February, 1818) says —

18 "The Negotiations on foot with dependent Chiefs which shall be particularly noticed in a subsequent part of this despatch, menace the loss of the supremacy of Jaipur over all her dependents, and a considerable diminution of her power and resources"

A little further on he describes how one of these dependent Chiefs has actually come to him to become a dependent of the British Government

24. "Koowur Bukhtawur Sing, the son of Raja Ubhee Singh of Ketree wrote to me sometime ago, expressing an intention of coming to Dihlee, to which I immediately assented, in the hope that his coming might alarm the Court of Jypoor and expedite the conclusion of a Treaty"

25 "Since his arrival, I have entered into conditional engagements with him, acting in behalf of his Father, subject of course to the approbation or rejection of His Excellency The Governor-General to the following effect: Raja Ubhee Singh and his son and Heir Koowur Bukhtawur Singh engage for themselves and their successors to become Dependents of the British Government on the same footing on which they were before dependent on Jypoor, paying Tribute and performing Military service for us, on the same footing on which they have hitherto been bound to do the same for the Raja of Jypoor They throw off all allegiance to Jypoor and become exclusively attached to the British Government. In Return we protect them and guarantee their lawful possessions. In the event of an alliance with Jypoor, they will revert, at our desire, to their allegiance to the Raja, under the safeguard of our superintending influence"

26 "The only obligation which we come under by this engagement, is to secure Raja Ubhee Singh and his Heirs from any ill consequences which might follow the act of entering into such an engagement; and as without any engagement we should have been equally bound for our honour to prevent their suffering any injury from having come forward to seek a separate connexion with us, I trust that the arrangement is entirely unobjectionable, and that His Excellency the Governor-General will approve of my having adopted it without previous instructions.

27. My object was two-fold — Either to alarm the Court of Jypoor and stimulate them to the conclusion of a suitable alliance, by shewing, that we were not entirely dependent on their will, but were able and willing to establish order without their concurrence — Or if the Court should continue so senseless as not to

be moved by the prospect of the dissolution of its power over the dependent States connected with it, to lay a foundation for the conclusion of separate engagements which should bring all those states under our protection on the terms mentioned in the case of the Ketree Chief

29. The arrangement would be I conceive perfectly Justifiable in the event of the perserverance of the Court of Jypoor in its procrastination and evasion These Chiefs are Dependents and Tributaries, not subjects They are independent Rulers in their own Territories They pay Tribute or Military Service or both to the Raja of Jypoor and are entitled to protection If not protected their obligations cease, and they have a right to carry their Tribute and Allegiance, where they can obtain security in return

32 The Jypoor State may be considered as divided into three principal Branches, consisting of the Raja and his own territories and dependent Chiefs as one Branch, the Nurooka Chiefs as the second and the Shekhawatee Chiefs as the third. Raja Ubhee Sing is one of the principal of the Shekhawatee Chiefs, and the Raja of Oomara is the first in rank and power of the Nurooka Chiefs. The Rao Raja of Macheree is a Nurooka and was formerly on the same footing with the Rao Raja of Oomara with respect to the Raja of Jypoor

33 The appearance of negotiating separately with the dependent Chiefs of the Jypoor State has had a good effect if I may judge from appearances. The Jypoor Agent stationed here shows unfeigned alarm and has repeatedly implored me to suspend these operations, till the arrival of the Ambassadors The intelligence seems also to have excited a great sensation at Jypoor and to have increased the anxiety to expedite the progress of the Mission appointed to proceed to Dihlee

---

EXTRACTS from Lieutenant Colonel Lockett's Journal and Report on Shekhawattee, in April 1831

76 During the private conference I had with the Dhabae he spoke with very little reserve, respecting the character and proceedings of the Jypoor administration, particularly of the open attempts which had been made and which were still being made by Jotha Ram the Minister to seize on, (through some pretence or other) the Khetree possessions, Jotha Ram and his associate Thakoor Sham Singh Shekhawut of Bussoo, were the known vindictive enemies he said of the Raj

81 The next question for consideration, is the tenure of the lands, in the possession of the Khetree Raja, and how and from whom they have been obtained.

90 With respect to the tenure of the lands held by the Khetree Paneh, or family, and from whom obtained; I have already stated that the expulsion of the Keeam Khanees from Jhoonjhnoo and Nurhur, is generally supposed to have occurred about the year 1735. The Shekhawats of Khetree, admit however, that it may have been three or four years later, *i e*, about 1739 * In either case, the event must have happened during the Weakness of Muhammad Shah's administration when the Mahrattas had over run every part of the Country, and had actually compelled the Monarch to pay them the Chout or fourth of all his revenues If in 1739 it would have been at the very time of Nadir Shah's invasion and when he was perhaps plundering the Capital Such a period was well suited for lawless aggression and at this precise period Sardool Singh of Odeepoor seized on the two districts in question.

* I have since ascertained that it occurred in 1731

The celebrated Jye Singh, surnamed Sewae, was then Raja of Jyepoor, and Sardool Singh, with a view to secure his forbearance and perhaps his support, in times of necessity offered to hold the conquered districts from him as a Tributary. The arrangement was approved and the lands were divided among the Chieftain's five sons, and are now held by their descendants in coparcenary, paying the stipulated Tribute to the present day

With the districts of Jhoonjhnoo and Nurhur Sardool Singh had taken possession of 12 villages on the Nurhur frontier, belonging to the Pergunnah of Singhana then in the King's Khalsa, and the Amil in charge, did not consider it safe or prudent to dispute the Act. This encouraged Bhopal Singh some years afterwards (in the reign of Ahmed Shah) to call in the aid of his two Brothers, Nouwul Singh (p 91) and Keseree Singh, and to add Singhana to their other conquests; Bhopal Singh's share was one half of the district and the other half was divided between his two Brothers. Zorawur Singh, whose assistance had not been required, was allowed no share, and the Estate continues to the present day in the possession of the three brothers

The Tribute was fixed at the time and continues unaltered.

Besides the three Pergunnahs of Jhoonjhnoo, Nurhur and Singhana which the descendants of Sardool Singh hold immediately from Jyepoor as Tributaries, in the manner above described; there is another district called Bubae which the Khetree Raja farms from the Raja of Jyepoor

Power of Thakoors.

45 "The landed nobles are held responsible for the safety of life and property within their estates; and they exercise certain powers over their tenants in criminal and civil matters The extent of these powers varies, it depends on custom and usage regulated by the status and position of the noble"

"Powerful feudatories, as Seekur and Khetree, are almost as independent in domestic arrangements, as their Suzerains themselves are free of control from the British Government in respect of their internal administrations." (See Political Administration Report of Rajpootana for the Years 1865-6 and 1866-7, by Lieut - Colonel W F. Eden, Agent Governor General, Rajpootana, pp 11—12)

"The estates, not crown lands, may be thus divided:—
2nd, Allodial .. .. The second are such dependent chiefships as those of Seekur, Khetree Oomara and others, not originally granted by the Durbar." (Ibid page 54)

Seekur Khetree Patun, Bussao

198 "In Shekhawattee there are several tributary chiefships, the most important of which are noted on the margin (Ibid page 55).

14 "One of the first steps taken by the Maha Rajah after the death of Sheodeen was to make a searching enquiry into the condition of the revenues of the State" (Ibid page 166)

SHEKHAWATTEE

13 "During the last cold season I visited all the principal Chiefs of this locality, and assembled them all at Jhoonjhoo, the head-quarters of the Government" (See The Political Administration Report of the Rajpootana States for 1867-68, by Major W H Beynon Political Agent, Jeypore, page 29).

27. "Since joining this appointment I observe that several of the influential Thakoors have visited the capital, and each of them has expressed himself as agreeably surprised at the kind interest shown in him personally by His Highness the Maharajah, and the evident anxiety on his part to retain them in undisturbed possession of their estates This is the more gratifying when it is remembered that their visits have been made with the view of their being formally installed in their respective States on paying a succession nuzurana, which until quite lately, has been resisted by most of them as an unauthorized innovation" (Ditto: by Captain E R C Bradford, Officiating Political Agent, Jeypore, p 66)

SHEKHAWATTEE.

59 "The condition of the Petty States in Shekhawattee is gratifying. Content reigns among all classes, and the ill-feeling which formerly characterized the relations of Suzerain and nobles is fast disappearing, owing to the increased consideration with which the latter are treated by the Darbar, a notable instance of which is the promptitude with which questions of succession are now treated The change in the condition of Shekhawattee during the last few years is marked, and is highly creditable to the Maharajah's Government and the Political Agents who have brought it about" (See Political Administration Report of the Rajpootana States for 1870-71, by Colonal J C Brooke, Offg Agent, Govr-Genl, in Rajpootana, page 16)

"It is doubtless an important duty on the part of the Darbar, in dealing with these comparatively speaking wild tributaries, to remember that long-established custums and hereditary rights are matters a peremptory interference with which can but result in the destruction of every particle of loyalty and good feeling" (Ditto: by Captain E R C Bradford, Offg Political Agent, Jeypoor, page 78).

— —

POLITICAL HISTORY OF JAIPUR.

"The population in the settled part of Jeypore does not differ from that of the rest of Rajputana: but there are pecularities in Shekhawatee, which are deserving of notice The whole of the district is owned by Rajpoot Thakoors, the descendants of Shekhjee, the grandson of (page 9) Oodey Kurrun, the 12th Maharajah of Jeypore, who conquered Shekhawatee from the "Khaemkhanees" Musalman descendants of apostasized Chohan Rajpoots, to whom the country formerly belonged, but who were allowed to hold their estates by the Emperors of Delhi as the reward of their apostacy The Shekhawats eventually coalesced with them, so far as to give in to many of the Musalman prejudices. The shrines of Mahomedan Saints are equally reverenced as those of the Hindu divinities, the Mahomedan confession of faith is said at the birth of their children, and wild hog's flesh which the Rajpoot elsewhere loves so much, is forsworn in Shekhawatee. The ownership of the land resting with the Shekhawat." (See Political History of Jaipur State by Colonel J. C. Brooke pp. 8 and 9)

"The estates not crown property are :—... .. ...

2nd—Allodial Estates conquered by the ancestors of the owner."... ...."This class includes the Shekhawats generally, with Seekur (4 lacs) Khetri ($2\frac{1}{2}$ lacs) Oomara ($1\frac{1}{2}$ lacs) etc" (Ibid pp 10 and 11).

EXTRACTS from "Personal Narrative of a Tour through Rajwara, in 1835" by Lieutenant A H. E Boileau (page 9).

"About a hundred years have passed away since the Shekhawuts dispossessed the Kaim-Khanees, by whose Nuwab these towers were raised."

To

Major Thoresby,

Offg Political Agent.

Jeypoor

2 Referring to the 3rd para of your letter I think it is highly important and desirable that we should understand the position in which the Sheikawattee Tribuaries or Feudatories stand to their Paramount State of Jeypoor—lest in our proceedings, during the Minority at Jeypoor, we be drawn into unnecessary and unjustifiable interference with the rights and privileges of these parties—and destroy in some degree, the substantial position of the inferior party—that in which they have been accustomed to stand, to which in all probability they will revert when we withdraw and which they will not relinquish now, or then without a struggle

3 It appears to me very probable that Jeypoor stands towards these petty states in the very same position in which as the paramount power in India, we stand towards Jeypoor itself, that they may owe service either of a defensive kind when Jeypoor is attacked, or of an offensive kind, when Jeypoor is levying foreign war—and that they may be tributaries at the same time Curiously enough there is both at Seekur and Khetree, the principal of them I believe, minorities as at Jeypoor—so that in reality we now, during the minority of the Chiefs, naturally or necessarily assume over these feudatories or tributaries of Jeypoor, the same jurisdiction as we do over Jeypoor itself, during the Minority of the Maha Raja But we are not entitled to exercise in our capacity at Jeypoor towards those petty states, any jurisdiction superior to that which Jeypoor as their paramount is herself entitled to exercise,

4 It is therefore highly important if I am right in my supposition that we should not confound things which are in themselves distinct—and that we should proceed with great caution in introducing any changes in the institutions of these feudatories calculated to destroy their substantive condition

5 It is on these principles I conclude that as Head of the Jeypoor Regency you have been endeavouring to effect a change in the administration at Khetree and Seekur and your declaration that "if they paid their tribute regularly, and preserved peace and good order within their several jurisdictions, Jeypoor would

have little claim to interfere in their affairs'— satisfies me that the substantive position is fully understood and recognised and that it will be your object so to improve the form of their administration as to throw responsibility on themselves for the performance of these obligations—and to leave them now and when our interference in the affairs of Jeypoor shall terminate, in the possession of their rights

6 But I have thought it my duty to record these opinions for your consideration—and, should you think this necessary I shall be happy to enter on the full discussion of this important question, for I am sure you will agree with me in the opinion that only good can result from a perfect understanding of this question at this early period of the exercise of our Supremacy over Jeypoor.

I have etc.,
(Sd) J SUTHERLAND,
Offg Agent Governor-General.

Rajpootana Agency, Ajmere,
The 30th August, 1840

Lt Colonel Sutherland,
Offg Agent to the Govr-General,
for the States of Rajpootana

2 There can be no doubt that the several Chiefs of Sheikhawattee, who all pay tribute to Jeypoor owe allegiance to the parent and paramount State, and would be considered bound to afford Military Assistance in Case of need as she would deem it incumbent upon her to aid them were they attached by a foreign enemy, and very naturally claim the right to interfere for the preservation of peace and good order, and to mediate differences which may arise among them, and might otherwise terminate in blood-shed and rapine. But the degree of allegiance by which they are bound, has never been strictly defined, and in practice it has generally, I think, depended on the relative strength and position of the respective parties What has been termed the Sheikhawattee Confederacy may be said to be no longer extant, and there seems to be little probability of circumstances arising that might call it into existence again, and induce an union of interests among the different petty states. The desire to be relieved from the annual payment of Fouj Khurch, which bears hard upon them, or to have that imposition lightened, is the only point on which there is any thing like unity of sentiment at this period

3 The Governments, if that term may be applied to denote the management of his estate by a petty Chief, possessed of two or three villages, or shares

in several villages, were formerly independent and absolute within themselves But this state of things was the source of many evils and has been modified in some respects, since our Troops entered Sheikhawattee in 1834 with respect to all the minor estates, while the Rajes of Seekur and Khetree, remain much as they were, excepting that a greater degree of interference, and more supervision. is exercised towards them, than would be requisite if the Princes were not in a state of nonage. This necessary interference and control does however, I conceive, attach to the Government of Jeypoor, and cannot be considered to belong to the Agent here in his political capacity of British Functionary resident at the Court, as the district of Sheikhawattee was resigned by us to Jeypoor in 1836-37 without reservation

I have etc.,
Sd C THORESBY,
Offg Poll Agent.

Jeypoor Political Agency,
4th September 1840.

To

H Torrens Esquire,
Offg Secretary to Government of India,
Fort William

SIR,

A question of some difficulty and delicacy has arisen connected with the management of the Jeypoor Tributary and Feudatory Chiefships of Shekhawattee, and I think it proper to submit for the consideration of the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India, and for such orders as to his Lordship in Council may seem necessary on this question, a copy of correspondence as per margin which has lately passed between Major Forster, and me, and Major Thoresby and me. relating to those Chiefships

From Major Forster dated	14th	Augt '40	
To	do	22nd	do
To Major Thoresby		22nd	do
From	do	28th	do
To	do	30th	do
From	do	4th Sept	

3 It is in virtue of our supremacy over Jeypoor itself that Major Thoresby is now head of the Jeypoor Regency established over that State during the Minority of the Sovereign His position there necessarily gives to that Government power and supremacy over all its tributaries and Feudatories, which its own powerless condition unsupported by us, would not enable it to exercise, and although there is no fear that whilst Major Thoresby is the Head of the Regency, that power will be abused Yet, in so far as these Chiefships are concerned, there appears to me to be something anomalous or undefined in his position as Agent and Head of the Regency, and which referring to the observation contained in the 3rd para, of his last despatch of the 4th instant which I shall quote below, requires to be settled by the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India in Council

"The Rajas of Seekar and Khetree remain much as they were, excepting that a greater degree of interference, and more of supervision is exercised towards them, than would be requisite if the Princes were not in a state of nonage. This is necessary interference and control does however I conceive attach to the Government of Jeypoor, and cannot be considered to belong to the Agent here in his Political Capacity of British Functionary Resident at this Court as the District of Sheikhawattee was resigned by us to Jeypoor in 1836/37 without reservation."

True Extract,

J. SUTHERLAND,

10th September, 1840. Offg Agent Govr.-General.

Lieutt Col. J. Sutherland,

Offg Agent to the Governor-General in Rajpootana.

Sir,

I am directed by the Right Hon'ble the Governor-General in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 10th instant with the corresp. which accompd. it; and in reply to state, that the degree of authority which the Jeypoor Regency should exercise over the Feudatories of that State must be regulated by circumstances, both as respects the internal condition of the Feudatory state and the occasion on which the interference of the superior power may be thought necessary

2 His Lordship in Council does not perceive how any rule of guidance can be laid down for Major Thoresby in this question As a Member of the Council of Regency he has of course a voice as to the policy to be pursued with respect to the Jeypoor Feudatories; and he will use his discretion, His Lordship in Council doubts not, with good effect in discriminating between occasions which call for the exertion of superior authority, and those in which interference is unadvisable.

3 Former usage on these points should, in so far as is possible consonant with the maintenance of order, be consulted and adhered to and His Lordship in Council concurs with you that the presence and association with the Regency of a British Officer, should not be employed so as to reduce the eventual position and privileges of the Shekhawatee Chiefs, excepting in as far as may be absolutely requisite for the preservation of the general tranquillity.

I have etc,

(Sd) H. TORRENS,

Offg Secretary to Government of India.

Fort William,
28th September, 1840

66 In the end, and largely as a consequence of the views and circumstances summarized in the preceding paragraphs, the Thikanedars, though they lost the external independence they had enjoyed in the Time of Trouble, succeeded in retaining their internal autonomy, provided they behaved themselves and stood well with the Government of India The weakness of Maharaja Jagatsingh had allowed them to become almost independent Chieftains. Ochterlony's Settlement was intended to bring them into proper relations of subordination to the State; but, as Sutherland wrote in 1841, "the means of upholding the settlement accomplished through our interposition are often withheld from us". A minority Administration of 33 years stabilized their tenures, gave their net payments the appearance of a fixed Tribute, left them to their own devices in domestic matters and taught them to look for political authority less to the State than to the Government of India They were, in fact, though retained in formal subordination to the Jaipur Darbar allowed to act in internal affairs almost as if they were independent units Thus in 1839 the Government, of India wrote "The Sikar Government, like that of Khetri, acts independently of Jaipur and might be allowed to do so, so far as we are concerned, always, when it performs its obligations to Jaipur and other States" The lesser Chiefs of Shekhawati were similarly described by the Political Agent as "more of tributaries than feudatories of the Jaipur State, to which they owe no kind of service and which would have little claim to interfere in their affairs, if they paid their quotas of tribute regularly

66. The cessation of the period of trouble was due to the treaty of 1818. By Clause 8 of that Treaty the Jaipur Maharajah was to remain the ruler of his dependents "according to long-established usage." Therefore whatever independence they may have previously shown about continuing to pay their tribute was no longer open to them. This liability was frequently brought home to the Shekhawatti Chiefs *by the British Political Officers.*

But that they were not to be in any worse position in all other respects than was supported by long-established usage is equally made clear by the orders of the *Government of India* of which one sample is the Governor General's reply to Lt. Col. Sutherland dated 28-9-1840 para 2. "His Lordship in Council does not perceive how any rule of guidance can be laid down for Major Thoresby in this question As a Member of the Council of Regency he has of course a voice as to the policy to be pursued with respect to the Jeypoor Feudatories; and he will use his discretion. His Lordship in Council doubts not, with good effect in discriminating between occasions which call for the exertion of superior authority, and those in which interference is unadvisable. Former usage on these points should, in so far as is possible, consonant

and preserved peace and good order within their several jurisdictions" "The Governments," he writes again, "if that term may be applied to denote the management of his Estate by a petty Chief possessed of two or three villages or shares in several villages, were formerly independent and absolute within themselves" When every petty Thakur in Shekhawati was the head of a Government "formerly independent", when the leading Thikanedars were called States, their Offices Courts and their agents Ministers, it is hardly surprising that a class of landholders, already "big with their own importance", should have put forward extreme pretensions to political authority independent of Jaipur The British were the only agency capable, in the circumstances in which the State was situated at the time, of defending the prerogative of the Maharaja. They did not appreciate how abnormal were the conditions which fostered the independence of the Thikanedars, and the case for the Maharaja, therefore, went by default

with the maintenance of order, be consulted and adhered to and His Lordship in Council concurs with you that the presence and association with the Regency of a British Officer should not be employed so as to reduce the eventual position and privilege of the Shekhawati Chiefs, excepting in as far as may be absolutely requisite for the preservation of the general tranquillity."

The weakness of the Maharaja, Jagat Singh, had nothing whatever to do with these Shekhawatti Chieftains having the rights of Independent Tributaries, as was found incontrovertibly by Metcalfe and all subsequent Political Officers. General Ochterlony dealt with the encroachments of the Jaipur Nobles in general, of the punishment of thieves and the like, and of customs duties in Jaipur proper. What Colonel Sutherland referred to in 1841 by the Settlement, unless it was the treaty, is hard to say, because admittedly the June 1818 Agreement was no longer considered. The minority Administration in no way stabilised the tenures or gave their net payments the appearance of a fixed tribute. The obvious controlling factor was the treaty with the Maharajah in April 1818 whereunder these tributaries were to remain subject "according to long-established usage". As has been noted above, but for the British Government's compelling adherence to the necessity to continue payment of

tribute to the Maharajah, it was no longer leviable, because it was a payment in return for protection and that had passed out of the hands of Jaipur into the hands of the British Government by the 2nd Clause of the treaty.

The paragraph rightly notes that the British Government in 1839 writing of Sikar says it acts independently of Jaipur like Khetri and might be allowed to do so, so far as we are concerned, always, when it performs its obligations to Jaipur.

The difficulty of holding smaller Thikanedars as independent Chieftains must have been as apparent to the Political Officer who wrote the despatch here quoted, as it is to the author of these comments. Nevertheless he had to state the position as it was in his time. There are many small principalities in various parts of the world even to-day. In these inaccessible and outlying regions it is extremely probable that these Chieftains were entirely uncontrolled rulers of their lands, as long as they paid their tribute. In those days the assertion of any sovereignty was too clearly infructuous for any one to think of suggesting it

When one has read the Political Records of the Government of India its seems extraordinary to find it stated in the Report that "the British Officers did not appreciate how abnormal were the conditions"

and to be told that "the case for the Maharajah went by default" in their hands. All the records show that by every means in their power the various British Officers were attempting to increase the Revenues and Rights of the Jaipur State and were completely alive to the unusual conditions caused by a Regency from within the purdah, the insubordination of the Nobles and the lawlessness of the inhabitants in the outlying Districts.

67. Further proof, if such is needed, of the decadence of the State's authority throughout this period is to be found in the continued misappropriation of State lands. I have already mentioned the extensive resumptions of 1818 and the agreements forced upon the Thakurs in the following year, to protect the interests of the State. These were ineffective. In 1840 proposals had to be submitted "for the resumption of Jagirs granted by the several administrations since the death of the late Maharaja"; and in 1847 we again read of "extensive embezzlement of the public resources." On each occasion the villages recommended for resumption were estimated as likely to yield over a lakh of repees to the State Treasury. Needless to say, it was the authority of the British which enforced these resumptions. The State itself was powerless to prevent encroachments, as it was meekly acquiescent when the British in 1836 desired the large and important Thikana of Khandela to be given back to its old holders. When Khetri rebelled in 1813 and Sikar became the scene of serious

67. The continued misappropriation of State lands was due to the Minister of the time helping himself and his family secretly to the State lands; to the Regent Rani and her family doing the same. These encroachments were by the Ruler, and her Minister whom the British Officers were upholding as the best of a poor lot. About 1840 came disclosures and efforts to cause restitution. These encroachments were an entirely separate matter to those referred to in 1818. The State was powerless because it was the heads of the State who were the offenders.

The case of Khandela was altogether different and had nothing to do with encroachment. Sikar had obtained it by conquest in 1813 and secured confirmation by a grant from Maharajah Jagat Singh in 1813. Sir David Ochterlony made Sikar disgorge, and after temporary

disturbances in 1846, it was again the authority of the British Government which had to be invoked for the restoration of order.

leases Sikar gave it up in 1824 Those who had owned it when Sikar conquered it now began to act as outlaws with such effect that the Government of India considered that the only course was to restore them their lands on the old tribute. The Khetri matter also requires setting out. In 1843 there was a contention as to the extent of the outstanding debt due to Jaipur.

The Jaipur forces proceeded against Kotputlee, which was a British grant and not liable for any debt Such aggression was prevented by the British Government. A Settlement was arrived at after that and payment made.

On a proper consideration therefore of the Minority Administration period, it will be apparent that the British Officers took every care in the interests of the State and the British Government to prevent any improper advantages being gained by Tributaries or nobles at the expense of the State and that they were constantly having to consider the real status of the Shekhawatti Chiefs.

The Jaipur Minister Jota Ram, who was a confirmed enemy of Khetry, as Col Lockett noted in his journal, would undoubtedly have stated the real position of this Chief as that of a mere sublessee if that had been the fact The Regent Rani would have said the same if it had been the

case. That these Chiefs had not usurped a position of independence is clear, because, as is shown in paragraph 63 of the Report, they required and received a guarantee from the British Government for their future safety for having dared to take a part against the Regent mother.

Metcalfe (see Political Consultations of 4-VI-1832) had again to trenchantly remind Jhota Ram of such protection having been given to Khetri when he found him "so unalterably determined against Khetri" and proceeding with an army against it. There are indeed no factors from which it can be concluded or even assumed that during the minority the Thikanedars gained any improvement of Status

PART III—CURTAILMENT OF THE THIKANEDARS' INTERNAL AUTONOMY

68 For the years subsequent to 1850 *I have had no access to British official* correspondence My summary for this period is based on scattered publications and on such incomplete papers in the State Record Rooms as I have chanced to lay hands upon The relationship between the Maharaja and his leading Thakurs is a matter to which the Political Officer has always given close attention. The Government of India have always been to the Thikanedar the ultimate Court of Appeal in case of any real or fancied encroachment on his rights He

PART III—CURTAILMENT OF THE THIKANEDARS' INTERNAL AUTONOMY.

68 It is very satisfying to read in this paragraph that—"The relationship between the Maharajah and his leading Thakurs is a matter to which the Political Officer has always given close attention." It is a thousand pities that this very correct appreciation of the duties which the Political Officers so carefully carried out was not remembered when the author wrote that "The case for the Maharajah went by default" (para. 66) or when he drew the

has access to the local Resident; and it may be safely asserted that no important change affecting his position vis-a-vis the State could, in the past, have been introduced without, at least, the passive acquiescence of the Political Department Up to the Mutiny the view that the Thikanedars should be maintained in a position of almost complete internal autonomy, subject to the performance of their obligations to the State (i e the payment of Tribute) and to the maintenance of law and order within their limits, seems to have been accepted by that Department The general standard of administration was low; and the Government of India, under the influence, no doubt, of the "feudal" or "allodial" theory and of their mistaken regard for the former independence of these petty "States", were prepared to let matters take their course in the Thikanas, provided there was no disturbance of the public peace

conclusion that the Thikanedars were given an absolutely fictitious Status by these same Political Officers. If the Government of India "have always been to the *Thikanedar*"—*Not* to the Jaipur State—"the ultimate Court of Appeal" it is clear which side was always feeling in need of protection. This is strange, if the minority administration was so weak.

69 Major Thoresby, the Political Agent in 1841 when Colonel Sutherland's report was written, urged, after the restoration of Shekhawati to the Jaipur Darbar (see paragraph 64 above), that "the immediate control over the affairs of the Smaller Estates should never again, in my opinion, be abandoned, for they cannot be left entirely to themselves without the certain prospect of many serious evils springing up incontinently; and it is especially with reference to the part of Shekhawati comprising them — the portion frequently *termed Jhunjhunuwati — that I feel anxious* to see established a mild system of civil administration, including the maintenance of a respectable Court of Justice for the

69. Major Thoresby's plan for creating in 1841 a mild system of Civil Administration including the maintenance of a respectable Court of Justice for the disposal of all Civil and Criminal business was nearly a a century in advance of the times. It is only within the last few years that there has been enacted in Jaipur a Penal Code or a Criminal Code. Most of the Civil Law is as recent. There were circulars, but even the Sessions Court had only incomplete copies of them within the last ten years. No one else had them. There were no

disposal of all the Civil and Criminal business that may arise Such a Court should be generally supervised by the Civil and Criminal Authorities at Jaipur, who might have appellate jurisdiction in all suits of importance" Major Thoresby's suggestion does not seem to have found favour The Government of India had no knowledge, apparently, of the Articles of 1818, which required cases of theft and other offences against property committed within Thikana limits to be submitted for the orders of the Darbar. While remarking that "former usage should, in so far as is possible and consonant with the maintenance of order, be consulted and adhered to", they insisted that "the presence and association with the Regency of a British Officer should not be employed so as to reduce the eventual position and privileges of the Shekhawat Chief, excepting in so far as may be absolutely requisite for the preservation of the general tranquility."

70 Matters, therefore, remained much as they were for another quarter of a century. This meant that the old order of things, which was the negation of police in Shekhawattee then; nor were tnere there any laws.

The Goverment of India realised that the scheme was premature. The Government of India were always conscious that it was due to their overpowering superiority that the dependent Chiefs were by the Treaty compelled to contiue to pay tribute. When the protection for which it was paid was no longer a consideration, the Chiefs might well have felt themselves absolved from further payment but for the iron grip of the treaty.

Further than that, however, the Government of India was not prepared to go and therefore insisted that "former usage should, in so far as is possible and consonant with the maintenance of order, be consulted and adhered to" and insisted that the presence of a British Officer should not be employed so as to reduce the eventual position and privileges of the Shekhawat Chiefs excepting in so far as may be absolutely requisite for the preservation of the general tranquillity. As this is all quoted from the end of paragraph 69, it seems that the Report has stolen the Thikanedars' thunder.

70. As no system of Civil or Criminal Courts, Excise, Public Works or Public Education had dawned in the Thikanas or probably in Jaipur itself

systematic administration, was allowed to continue The Shekhawats were at this time "a congregation of plunderers". As late as 1867 an official report on Rajputana observes that "the people of Shekhawati still continue to be noted for their plundering propensities" and remarks on "the wild and independent character of the people and the normal condition of dacoity which exists among them." In such circumstances anything like a system of Police, of Civil or Criminal Courts, of Customs, Excise, Public Works or Public Education had not dawned, and could not dawn, above their horizon. Non-interference by Jaipur did not, therefore, involve any wide devolution of administrative power to the subordinate Thikanedars There was merely an absence of administrative activity

71. After the Mutiny a new spirit was aroused; and, before many years had passed, we read in the Jaipur State of Posts and Telegraphs, of Roads and Railways and of Medical and Educational institutions Even in Shekhawati, after ten years of somewhat unsettled conditions subsequent to the Mutiny, comparative tranquillity began to prevail The Government of India's adherence to the principle of non-interference by the State in the affairs of its Thikanedars was now modified by new practical considerations For example, free-trade in grain became an urgent necessity during the famine of 1868, and the abolition of transit-dues was required to assist the new railway which was gradually opened in the seventies In both cases the Maharaja was encouraged to issue orders which

in 1867, there could be no question of "any wide devolution of administrative power" any more than there could have been a devolution of the right to fly aeroplanes in Shekhawatti.

71. In the smaller Thikanas whose exchequer cannot afford the expense requisite for Police or Civil or Criminal administrations the Government of India have permitted a usurpation of their rights by the Suzerain State from the necessity of the thing, but rightly declined to countenance a similar course where the larger Thikanas can and have taken in hand the inauguration of such administrations. Interference has rightly been restricted so as to encroach as little as possible on that independence which has been all along held to belong to the Thikanedars. As there never has been any State Administration of Customs or Excise in these Thikanas

were to take effect throughout his territories. The extradition Treaty of 1868 was also made applicable, through the Maharaja, to the whole of the Jaipur State. Again in regard to Police and Judicial functions, the Political Department, which defined the precise extent of the State's interference in the Thikanas, followed in the end the policy that Major Thoresby had recommended. When regular Police with Civil and Criminal Courts were provided by the State for its Mofussil, these were at once permitted to function in every Thikana except Sikar, Khetri and Uniara. I have been unable to find any State paper which explains the reasons for making these exceptions. They were, doubtless, suggested by practical considerations. The Thikanedars with the largest income and territory were allowed to organize their own Police and Civil and Criminal Courts. The rest, though of precisely the same origin and theoretical status, were not given these powers, simply because they were not considered qualified to exercise them. This, roughly speaking, is the position to the present day in regard to the exercise of Special Powers by the subordinate Thikanedars. They stand out, on principle, for their "ancient right" to internal autonomy; and the Political Department is inclined to respect their claim, since it regards them as Chieftains enjoying some inherent claim to domestic independence and to dominion over the soil; but, when vital questions arise regarding, for example, the administration of Justice and the organization of Police, theoretical considerations are disregarded. This explains the recent reservation for trial by State this encroachment is very rightly not permitted by the Government of India.

Courts of all Sessions cases arising in Sikar, Khetri and Uniara In minor matters which do not directly relate to the maintenance of law and order, the State has not, as a rule, been permitted as yet to intervene. Thus all the Thikanedars dealt with in this report still remain outside the State's administration of Customs and Excise

72 Looking at the matter broadly, we can see that the history of the territorial Thikanedars of the Jaipur State falls naturally into three periods The first is the period in which their territorial rights developed Beginning as mere Ijaredars, they rose gradually to the position of almost independent Chiefs, owing an uncertain allegiance to the harassed Maharaja of Jaipur. During this, the Maratha period, the establishment of their territorial rights was the point at issue In the end they won their way to a solid proprietory tenure, subject to the payment of a small quit-rent to the State In the next period, which covers approximately, the fifty years which followed the British Treaty of 1818, their territorial rights were never questioned, but the political independence which they had acquired in the Time of Trouble was withdrawn by the British Government which, at the same time, conceded them administrative autonomy in the management of their internal affairs The abiding purpose of the British Government was to secure peace and tranquility; and so long as this was achieved, they had no wish either themselves to interfere in the domestic concerns of these Thikanas or to allow the State to do so The third period extends from about 1865

72. There may be said to be broadly three periods

1st Period — 1730-1750 — Conquest. Territorial acquisition of these areas in 1730, which remain subject to the tribute paid by previous rulers. The Thikanedars take a sublease for collecting and paying such tribute during the time that Jaipur holds ijaras of the Jagirs, 1730-1750

They were, all the time, Independent Chiefs, having succeeded to this position that was held by the Qaimkhani Nawabs whom they had ousted. It is quite incorrect to consider that they gradually attained this Status. They had it from the very beginning During this period Jaipur is not harassed by any Mahratta or other forces.

2nd period — 1750 1818 The ijaras have ceased The Mahratta subjects Jaipur to a lumpsum payment. This includes the Shekhawati Country. The Panchpana pay the tribute to Jaipur as before because it is collecting on a lumpsum basis, for the new Ruling

(when the construction of a railway through Rajputana first came under discussion) down to the present day The policy of *laisser fair* for the Thikanas, which had satisfied the Government of India for half a century, no longer met the requirements of rising administrative standards The Political Department faced the problem in a practical spirit They abandoned the old principle of non-intervention by the State in the case of the smaller Estates which were manifesty unable to maintain their own Police and Civil and Criminal Courts The larger Estates of Sikar, Khetri an Umara were told to make suitable provision under these heads ; and when Umara failed to do so, it was forced into semi-dependence upon the Raj Police and the Raj Courts. Again, within the last six years, the State has taken over the trial and punishment of all accused persons in Sikar, Khetri and Umara who are charged under the Indian Penal Code with offences exclusively triable by a Court of Sessions In the other less responsible spheres of administration the Thikanas still regulate their own affairs, more or less In a word, the principle of non-intervention by the State, strictly enforced during the second period *has been partially abandoned in the third* — practical administrative considerations providing the only decisive test when questions arise for settlement between the Maharaja and his Thakurs

Power, Scindia and Jaipur, alone can help them from undue exactions and pillage. Their Status as sublessees is clearly no longer in existence. Sikar indeed for a time pays direct to the Mahratta, as Jaipur writes and says "I cannot help you. You must do the best you can for yourself." For a few years during the period 1770-1790 the Moghul Emperor re-establishes his *authority and collects the tribute from* the Thikanedars — not from Jaipur. Supremacy is rather in the melting pot, between the Moghul, Scindia, and Holkar.

There were in the last 20 years other War Lords, Ameer Khan and his kind. Tribute was collected and paid to whoever could exact it. If it was possible it was not paid to any one, but the Status of the Chiefs remained as it had been from the beginning. As the biggest local power ; connected by clan and tribal affinity, to whom the tribute had been customarily paid ; who could in return protect them from the depredations of others, tribute was more frequently paid to Jaipur than to any other power and certain remissions were secured from Jaipur which made payment to that power more favourable than it might have been if paid to any other. In 1818 the British Power recognises that tribute has been more frequently paid to Jaipur and its

Suzerainty acknowledged by various surrounding Chiefs than to any one else; it consequently binds them down to the position of dependents, but in accordance with long established usage.

The third period is the British period and the tribute, whatever it was, is held to be stabilised by long established usage.

No attempt is made during the next 115 years by Jaipur State to argue that the tribute should have been bigger than the amount fixed. The tributaries are not allowed to say that no tribute is any longer leviable because protection, which is the basis of the tribute can no longer be given by Jaipur. It must be remembered that Mr. Metcalfe had clearly recorded that they were independent Chiefs not owing allegiance to anybody. This position however they were never allowed to take up after the treaty. It was therefore the natural Justice of the case that their internal autonomy was preserved by the British Power and its help sought whenever a Thikanedar was threatened with oppression.

During this 3rd period modern standards have required advance and necessitated some encroachments on the rights and powers of the smaller Thikanedars from the poverty of their resources. This has been restricted by

the British Government to such action as was imperatively necessary. It seems to have been recently assumed that such interference would cover the right to try serious criminal cases at Jaipur which should territorially be tried in the Thikana in which the crime was committed.

Section V The Territorial Rights of the Thikanedars

PART I — PANCHPANA-SINGHANA

73. In the three preceding Sections I have sketched the varying fortunes of the Jaipur State, subsequent to its expansion by Sawai Jaisingh two hundred years ago, and have indicated, in a general way, the fluctuation from time to time in the relations subsisting between the central authority and its outlying Thikanedars I now proceed to deal in detail with the particular Estates which fall within the scope of this report No attempt will be made to give a consecutive history of these subordinate Thikanas, since I am here concerned merely with the territorial rights which they acquired from the State Special attention will be paid, however, to the circumstances in which the Jaipur Maharaja's authority was extended over the areas in question; to the local position (if any) held in each case by the earliest Thikanedar prior to his connection as an Ijaredar with Jaipur; to any Important additions, subdivisions or other variations affecting the areas concerned and, in particular, to the assessment imposed on them and to the character of the tenure disclosed by the methods of assessment. I shall deal, first, with Panchpana Singhana and Sikar, which comprise modern Shekhawati, and then with Babai, Khandela, Udaipurwati, Patan and Uniara

74 The tract now known as Shekhawati is not the Shekhawat country of Tod (see para 120 below); but it is a convenient unit. It has had a distinctive history; and can be geographically defined

Section V The Territorial Rights of the Thikanedars

PART I — PANCHPANA-SINGHANA

73. In Section 73 the assumption is made that some territorial rights were acquired from the State. This is a baseless conception. The rights were acquired from the Qaim Khanis by conquest. No rights whatever were *acquired from the State*

It is not clear what is meant by the sentence "the character of the tenure disclosed by the methods of assessment

74. The non-liability to tribute has been somewhat misunderstood. The liability to the Emperor is not contested. There was no liability to pay Jaipur

with fair accuracy as the trans-Aravali portion of the State Jhunjhunu and Fatehpur were formerly the chief towns in this tract and gave their names to the surrounding country. At the close of the 16th century, as we know from the Ain-i-Akbari (see Appendix D), these areas were in the possession of Qaimkhanis — a sect of Rajput converts to Islam — whose local consequence down to the time of Sawai Jaisingh is proved by references early in the 18th century to Qaimkhani Nawabs. We are told that in a 2nd regnal year (probably, therefore, 1708 or 1714 A D.) "Qayam Khan, Zamindar of Fatehpur" was appointed Faujdar of Sambhar (O. H. R 86); and we learn from a *parwana* of 1718 that the parganahs of Jhunjhunu and Kot Kasim were then in the Jagir or Watan of Diwan Qayam Khanji, who was Faujdar of these parganahs and on friendly terms with Sawai Jaisingh (P. S 2) The claim is now put forward by the Shekhawats of Panchpana-Singhana and Sikar that they entered this trans-Aravali tract as independent conquerors, and that having crushed the Qaimkhanis, they proceeded by right of conquest to divide up the country among themselves; that they held it, at first, free of all outside interference and were liable to no tribute; but that later, under pressure, they consented to make a fixed annual payment to the Jaipur Darbar, in order to secure the protection and goodwill of their more powerful neighbour. This account has hitherto been generally accepted and is also found (with variations on the main theme) in the British publications which deal with Shekhawati.

any tribute; but as the farmer of the Jagirdar's right to the tribute (as his salary) the Jaipur State had the right to the tribute in 1730 and right up to 1750. Thereafter it had no right and future payments to it were on varying grounds: viz. as part of the lumpsum payment fixed by the Mahrattas and when that power had ceased to hold the position of the Emperor then in return for protection from all other powers ranging over the country. In this epoch it was for two small periods paid to the Moghul again, as shown earlier in the Reply.

The account of an origin by conquest has been generally accepted as it is based on all the available material on the spot and on all the information that high responsible officers were able to obtain from sources around them at the time they were representing the British Government in those localities. It is not "exaggeration by some local annalist", but is in fact borne out by the State Papers themselves if properly understood. This will be shown on the answer to Ss. 76 and 77.

It is, however, largely the product of exaggeration by some local annalist and I must, therefore, give the more authoritative version of Sawai Jaisingh's occupation of the tract.

75. So far as the Panchpana-Singhana area is concerned, the facts of the case disclosed by the old records of the State, are as follows. Sawai Jaisingh, having obtained Ijaras from the Mogul Authorities for this trans-Aravali district, proceeded to arrange for its administration through his own agents. In Jhunjhunu Sawai Jaisingh took the first Ijara of the parganah in 1728 from a local Jagirdar, named Islam Khan, on payment of Rs 13,196 — the Mogul assessment being 298,000 *dams* (P.S. 6) — and subleased it in the same year for Rs 31,915 to one Harisingh Chhabra, a substantial Baniya (P.S. 3A 7) who, as we are specifically informed, employed 1,000 Raj Sawars (State mounted contingent) to establish the Darbar's possession in the parganah.

75. Having got these contracts the Maharaja proceeded to arrange for the tribute collection. He did not proceed " to arrange for the administration of the district." This language is quite inappropriate to the facts. Jhunjhunu and Fattehpur were the two principal towns of two Qaimkhani Nawabs, who were the local Chiefs of whom Moreland says that "Where they (Chiefs) existed the assignee had to look to them and not to the peasants for his Income." p. 71. "In any case the relations between a Chief and his peasants would not be affected by the establishment of Moslem rule, except in so far as more money might have to be raised in order to pay the Revenue; inside the villages the established agrarian system would continue to function." p. 26 and p. 202. Now. Note the result of trying to collect the Revenue in a Mahomedan Chief's territory even for a powerful Baron such as Maharajah Jai Singh. He appoints a Banker Hari Singh Chhabra to collect the tribute. It seems that the Qaim Khani Chief declined to pay at first. The Chhabra had to employ 1000 Jaipur State Sowars and to give the

Nawab's Mutsaddi and Sardul Singh Rs. 1,000 between them.

These Sowars cost Rs. 8,490 " Jamiat Kharch" (P. S. 6 and 7). Even then Hari Singh does not manage to get into collecting possession (P.S. 3). Eventually he comes to terms with the Nawab "So I settled with the Zamindar that he must pay Rs. 31,000 out of which we will have to pay Rs. 1,000 to the Zamindar's Mutsaddi and Sardool Singh Shekhawat" (P. S. 4).

N. B.—In P. S. 4, P. S. 7, and P. S. 9 A Fazil Khan is always called the "Zamindar". The Qaimkhani Nawab executes a Qabuliat for Rs. 31,000 in proof of the undertaking. P. S. 9A. The Chhabra gives his account in P.S. 6. He states the total credit side at 31,945. (This additional Rs. 945 was collected by Tota Ram and Malook Chand as evidenced by P. S. 7) and total debit at Rs. 23,872/2/-.

Details of Debit.

To Islam Khan for Jagir	Rs.	13,196	0
To Sh. Hidayat Ullah for Jagir	"	119	0
Banking Charges for Hundi	"	193	8
Aloofa (maintenance charges of Sah Hari Singh	"	500	0
Pun (Charity)	"	55	0
Jamiat Kharch (i.e., the 1000 Sowars) ...	"	8,490	10

There are some other items also apparently, for he gives the total expenditure as Rs 23,872/2/-

This shows the expenditure at about Rs. 10,000/- and the net profit at Rs 8,000/- for 1726 A. D.

Hari Singh is not a sublessee; he is realising for the state as a state servant. Evidently collecting without the Zamindar as your Agent was very expensive. Incidentally it is wrongly stated that Islam Khan was a local Jagirdar. He did not belong to the locality. In 1726 his salary or Jagir was to be paid by the tribute due from this locality.

This is how Jaipur State Paper P. S. 3 of 1726 presents the situation The writer is a State servant writing, it seems, from Shekhawatti to Headquarters at Jaipur, about the taking of leases from Jagirdars. "Tell them that they would not get a single Dam. Firstly it is desert country. Secondly these are Bhumias (landed proprietors) so they should give the farm of their Jagirs. Also tell them that in case they do not give the farm there will be great turbulence in realising the Jagir." He also shows in his opening that without seeing the sanad for the Jagir the Zemindar will not pay.

P. S. 6A of 1726 A. D, is here to be noticed.

It is a memorandum of Sheo Singh's meritorious services and goes on "Therefore the Maharaja Shriji showed him Tazim and embraced him."

It was no doubt done in Durbar. Thsi very distinctively marked Sheo Singh out as a person of importance. Suchmarks of public favour do not fall to mere sublessees.

76 In 1730 Sawai Jaisingh, obtained the lease (Ijara) of the five Mogul Mahals of Jhunjhunu, Narhar, Gaonri (now Nim ka Thana), Babai and Udaipur from the Nawab Sayyid Muzaffar Ali Khan of Narnaul (P. S. 30, 40 & 49) and gave out these five Mahals, on a joint sublease for three years, to Mohansingh Nathawat, Harisingh Chhabra and Sardulsingh Shekhawat (*alias* Sadhu, the progenitor of the Sadhanis) for a total sum of Rs 1,46,273/1/-, out of which each accepted responsibility for Rs 48,757/12/- or one-third (P S 41 & 8) There was however, on Chait Budi 2 St. 1788 (1731 A. D.) a fight between Sardulsingh and "the Delhi forces" because of Sardulsingh's collections in Jhunjhunu (S. 41) and in the same year he was given a separate Ijara for that area including *mal* (land-revenue) *sayar* (miscellaneous revenu) and *kulli hububat* (all other cesses) on his agreeing to an annual assessment of Rs. 52 000 (P. S 43). The following year this demand was raised to Rs 75,162; Sardulsingh was told either to produce sureties for the increased amount or to make over the tract to the Faujdar and Mutsaddi of the Raj (P. S. 52 & 54); and there is no doubt but that he agreed to the revised assessment.

76. Here we come to the important year 1731-32. It was in this year that Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh ousted the Qaim Khanis from Fatehpur and Jhunjhunu pergannahs.

P. S. 8. shows that Rs. 178,585/3/- was payable to Mozaffar Khan for A D. 1730. That he had received Rs. 37,234/-/- leaving a balance of Rs. 1,41,351/3/- which was devided equally between Mohan Singh, Sardul Singh and Hari Singh at Rs 47,117/1/-. The same figures come out in P. S. 41. It is not apparent where the figures 48,757/12/- come from which are set out in the Report.

This covers all 5 Mahals; Jhunjhunu, Narhar, Gaonri, Babai and Udaipur. Then comes the very important year 1732 in which the Shekhawat ancestors establish their possession over Shekhawati.

The Report dismisses this period with a few lines, which is very curious, for it is the origin of the title and there

are quite a number of State papers which deal with it. The case for the Thikanedars is really established by the papers of the year 1732, both by those produced from the State Records and those now put in by the Thikanedars. In the Report Chait Budi 2 Sambat 1788 is incorrectly entered as 1731 A. D. It is really 12th March 1732.

The first paper is S. 40 B, a Jaipur State paper.

It gives us some idea of the happenings in this part of Rajputana in January A. D. 1732. Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh were cousins, descendants in the 6th and 5th degree respectively from the common ancestor Raisalji. Sheo Singh's family owned estates in Kasli, 84 villages and char patti Fatehpur, the Southern tract of what is now all known as Sikar. Sardul Singh had property in Udaipurwati and his wife being a niece of the Qaim Khani Nawab of Jhunjhunu's wife, he had become the Diwan at Jhunjhunu. It appears that Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh had evolved a scheme for conquering the northern part of Sikar with its principal town of Fatehpur: and Panch Pana, then Jhunjhunuwatti, with its principal town Jhunjhunu. They had required financial assistance from Khattris and the Maharajah of Jaipur's help, especially with regard to the Emperor's forces from Delhi.

This S. 40 B. is a letter of January A. D. 1732 written by Sheo Singhji and Sardul Singhji to a Jaipur Official Lala Hemraj. They say—"Twelve days after our departure from Hazur we stopped and had the amal of Sardul Singhji established in the Division of his share in Udaipur, Bhasawa and Gudha. TAKING ALL OUR BRETHREN WITH US except Gopal Singhji of Udaipur who did not go with us, we encamped in Fatehpur neighbourhood."

Then they say: A fight took place at Manhadi. We have been victorious by Shri Ji's grace. We have got with us about eight or nine thousand troops and by Shri Ji's grace we have sufficient forces and the Qaimkhanis of our side have joined us. There are about 2,000 men in Fatehpur. We will now start against Fatehpur and will write and tell you about what happens there. Many wealthy Fatehpur people have fled to Ram Singhji's villages. You should warn him about this and if he will not attend to it we will take action. The Cannon has even yet not arrived and in more villages a fight took place in which 11 of the old Nawabs men were killed and 4 of ours wounded.

This letter shows that the whole clan had joined in the conquest by

Sheo and Sardul except Gopal Singhji. The Cannon, which apparently was borrowed from Jaipur, had not then arrived, but they had been successful in all encounters nevertheless. The pharase "by Shri Ji's grace" is obvious oriental flowery phraseology.

The next paper is 40D, of the same month and year — 1732 A. D.— a latter by Sardul Singh and Sheo Singh to another Jaipur Official, Ayamal. It begins by referring to the fight previously mentioned in S. 40 B. Then it seems that negotiations were being initiated when the enemy received reinforcements and another engagement took place. The Shekhawats numbered 30,000 but only 10,000 were fighting men. The old Nawab was brought out to inspire his side but being wounded was rushed inside the fort again; so by Shri Ji's grace Victory still remained with the Shekhawats. They state: "We have pushed the Nawab inside the fort and have established our administration in the Town. The Nawab is soliciting his safety and negotiating for peace. News of subsequent events will be written afterwards." This also shows it was the venture of Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh and not of the Jaipur Mahrajah.

Then comes S. 40 F. A *much* more detailed letter of the following

month written by Sardul Singhji and Sheo Singhji to Lala Hemrajji, a Jaipur State Official. This is an extremely important document, because it shows as conclusively as anything can at this distance of time that the conquest of this territory was by Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh aided by all their clans, who are all enumerated, and, apart from a few friendly outsiders, are all Shekhawats. The only Jaipur assistance was the Cannon which however did not leave Jaipur until 2 days after the battles noted in S. 40 B. D. and F., were over. It was left by the Jaipur people at Khatu in the hands of Sheo Singh's men. (See S. 40 E.). The two Chiefs Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh command the two divisions of their army. There is no Jaipur commander or Jaipur contingent even. It is singular to find in Lt: Col. Lockett's Journal (page 90) that he had since ascertained that the ouster of the Qaimkhanis occurred in 1731. The Shekhawats told him it was 1735 or a few years later. Did he get his information of its being 1731 from the Jaipur Officials?

It was, as this letter demonstrates in great detail, a clan conquest by the Shekhawats on behalf of Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh and it establishes the correctness of all the British Records. There are expressions in the letter

such as 'The Sarkar's army was divided into two divisions' which might at first sight seem to mean that it was a Jaipur army, but the complete answer to that is *the fact that they are* none of them Jaipur men. It is simply an instance of Oriental politeness as before. Again, when the Qaimkhani Nawab [appealed to the Jaipur Maharajah, as when Paul appealed to Caesar, no one dared to ignore the Higher Power, and proceedings were stayed. In the ultimate, however, the Qaimkhani got nothing by his appeal. The letter with notes showing that it was a Shekhawati force, is here appended, as this is the most appropriate place to set out the case for these two Pergannahs. The Report deals with the British Records on this point again in S. 114—122 and therefore as has already occured with respect to many other points, a repetition will be necessitated in the Reply. The letter S. 40 F., although of the succeeding month, had to be referred to here because it carries on the record of the persons who captured Fatehpur. It will be necessary to refer to some other documents also at this point.

10 F.

To Lalaji Shri Hemrajji, Sardul Singhji and Shiv Singhji convey their compliments. All is well here. We wish the same to you. We have already written to you of past events We are now writing to you that on Posh Sudi 11, a battle was fought Kaimkhanji came and kept standing at a distance of a little more than a kos outside the town, and made three divisions of his army. Indar Singh Rathor of Churu with an elephant and 1,000 or 1,200 men, was in advance. Kaimkhanji on the back of an elephant, with 2,500 or 3,000 men was in the rear. The third division of Kaimkhanji's army consisting of Pelman of Jhunjhunu Khanzada, and Rathors, Bidawats, and Ashraf Khan Mudfar Khani were to the left More than 1,000 or 1,200 of the infantry and citizens were behind the three divisions, ready for an encounter. From this side, Sarkar's army was divided into two divisions as detailed below.—

One division		*Another division*	
Sardul Singhji (from Raisal through Bhojraj)	Brothers and sons. (relatives)	Shiva Singhji (from Raisal through Tirmal)	Brothers and sons (relatives)
Ruhilia Khanji of Jhunjhunu 1	Tanwar of Datil and Bhadoli of Maonda 1 (Sardul was grandson of a Tanwar Thakur of Maonda his mother was a Tanwarji).	Naraindasji from Khandela side (descended from Raisal through Girdhar)	Udaipur Siwaisinghji Dansinghji Gumansinghji Baghsinghji Jaitsinghji Rasoji. 1. (from Raisal through Bhojraj)
Mohkam Singh's son and Pahar Singhji from Khandela (through Girdhar son of Raisal).	Nirbhans of Paprona (a village 6 miles from Khetri)		
Ladkhani 1 (descended from Raisal).	Pathans of Baggur. 1. (Baggur is 8 miles from Jhunjhunu; under the influence of Sardulji).	Kumbhoji Bhojrajji of Khirod 1. (from Raisal through Bhojraj).	Bhojrajji grandson of Pratap Singhji and Sujansingji (Bhojraj branch)
Bishan Singhji of Churana (Bhojraji)	Gopalji ka Jharli wa bathule 1. (Gopal brother of Raisal).	Rupsinghji of Kuhoori 1. (Khandela branch).	Jodhsinghji S/o. Dipsinghji 1. (Sikar family).
Qaimkhanji, Madarikhanji and Nathukhanji of Fatehpur. 1. (Qaimkhanis siding with Sheo Singh)		Akhaisinghji of Dujod. (from Tirmal son of Raisal)	Jodhsinghji Harisinghji of Kohoor. Mehroli's share in half (Manoharpur branch).

Manrupsinghji Devi singhji of Sanwat Dasji 1 (Shekhawats)	Nibi ka Bagat ka jodha 1 (Rathors)
Gorisar ka Bidawat 1 (in Bikaner relatives by marriage of Sheo Singh)	

The battle began from the advance party in the morning. Firing was made for about a ghari 24 mins. After this the Sarkar's forces sent out horsemen from both the sides. Indersingh who was in advance fled away and 110 men were killed out of whom about 10 were relatives and about 70 were Rajputs. Indersinghji having run away, joined where Qumkhanji was standing. The Sarkar's forces, pursuing as, he could not make his stand there too. Qumkhanji too fled, and from his place of fight to the fort 150 brave men were killed. Qumkhanji was on the back of an elephant. Five arrows and one shot had hit him and eight or ten arrows were thrown after him. He entered the fort and shut the gates. The relative of Prohit Ghasi Ramji live at Jaipur and Fatehpur occasionally. Qumkhanji having called him said, "Seek the protection of Shriji, the town is being plundered, and if Shriji's orders are that I should be killed, then kill me; otherwise manage for the protection of the town and save me and let the army camp outside the town.' The relatives of the Prohits said these things to us. Then we camped near a wel outside the town and proclaimed the protection of Shriji in the town. By the grace of Shri Maharajaji we were victorious and 10 men of the Sarkars forces were killed and 150 men were slightly wounded by shot and arrows and 20 men had very slight scratches of the sword. By the grace of Shriji we were not hurt and Shriji was victorious and we received a letter of congratulations. It was written in it, "You should write after careful investigation at what places the refugees of Fatehpur have gone." Many are detailed in the note and we shall further write after ascertaining it. We had written of the urgent necessity of the cannon and it has reached us. All other men had already come but Narain Dasji was accompanied by a large number of men. About 600 or 700 foot had come. They were given 2200 rupees and played a very brave part in the battle. And Mohan Singhji's son came with about 600 men and were given 2200 rupees. Nobody from Man Singhji (1) of Amarsar's men came, and not a single horseman of Gaj Singhji (2) came, and Guman Singhji (3) did not come (*N. B* — These are three Shekhawat families).

List of the refugees of Fatehpur in the villages of Kasli:—

Village Nechhwa, Rohlani, Badlawali owned by Ram Singhji in which there are refugees, grain and Banias who came from Ganehri, Garoda, Kachwa, Nasanwah, Bhilodwa. The Bania of Ganehri was established by Mahasingh who will pay Rupees Forty-thousand.

Sundar, Sanwal, Rupo, Rathi and Badri will pay rupees Four or Five Thousand each

Village Ruhlani, owned by Jait Singhji where there are refugees from Manhar Ghana, Bajdoli, consisting of corn and well-to-do Banias. I am answerable (for the correctness of the statement that) so many Banias took refuge in these villages on the day that Manhadi was sacked. You should press Ram Singhji to compensate for this much property and if he has any objection to it, you should get a Muchalka written by him then and there If the refugees, consisting of Banias caste who fled on the day that Manhari was sacked, be in our village, I shall pay compensation for so much property We have occupied so many places and after occupation of other places, we shall write to you.

Miti Magh Badi 8, Sambat 1788

S. 40. *It is a letter written by Sheo* Singh, to a Jaipur Minister Vijayramji on 12th March, 1732. He says: You wrote to me that I am aware of the Huzur's point namely that my plan should be one that will bring in money. When I, Rajahmalji and Dipsinghji were with the Huzur, he asked me about the approximate income of the place where we intended to go. I had then set out that I proposed to levy Rs. 60,000 for payment to Khatris, Rs. 30,000 for expenses of expedition and Rs. 30,000 for Nawab Mozaffar Khan. Under very strong pressure a very big amount has been settled for which 80 villages of the 4 pattees have been mortgaged and the remaining villages are held in security (apparently a mortgage of his own southern Territories by Sheo Singh). About the amount to be paid in cash, they are making evasive promises. When the old Qaimkhani sent word to Delhi of

all this. Nawab Mozaffar Khan sent a force of 500 cavalry and 500 infantry which has up to now got as far as Narnoul. It is rumoured that they are appointing and removing men from Jhunjhunu as they like (That is to say Sardul Singh' position in Jhunjhunu is being undermined.) Hence the Maharajah of Jaipur should take measures to control the situation at Delhi. Everything depends on taking precautionary measures in *that* quarter. *If* that is done then we can all make money.

You ask why I want money. In reply I will tell you. It is said that a force will come to the assistance of the old Nawab from Delhi and they propose taking his son to Delhi. Cash has not yet been received. When we get that he can go. *These are the reasons* why I require money. If the *Nawab's* son does go there, what of it? *He* cannot take the country on his *head.*"

That is if the Maharajah can *manage* to checkmate his attempts *to get assistance* from the Imperial *forces* *his* going to Delhi is of no *consequence*, and it was with this *purpose that a sum of* Rs. 30,000 had *been earmarked* for the Imperial *Commander Nawab* Mozaffar Khan. It has *been already* shown in this reply *that N. Mozaffar*

Khan and Maharajah Jai Singh were very close friends, and the going out of Imperial forces without effecting any purpose was a common practice (See again Irvine Later Moghuls Vol: II pp. 123 and 279).

He then proceeds: You write that Rs. 70,000 is outstanding against Sardul Singh out of which nothing has been paid In reply to this I write that Rs. 27,000 have been paid in one instalment by Sardul Singh and for the payment of the remaining instalments he will surely furnish sureties.

Apparently there was some idea of getting hold of the young Qaimkhani. So he writes: You also ask me to bring Qaimkhani's son with the assurance that you will get all his business accomplished As to this my reply is that as long as the old Qaimkhani was alive there was a mutual understanding to this effect. Now that he is dead and the Cavalry of Mozaffar Khan is coming from Delhi to take his son up there, I hear that his affairs are being done through some other quarter. You also write about my being surety for not making reduction or depreciation in the income of this place. (One must bear in mind that Maharajah Jai Singh held the ijara of its tribute). My reply is:

What trustworthy man did you send with me, when I set out on this expedition and whom have I now got? Still all good men will bear in mind the interests of the Huzur as it he were God and will never conceal anything from him

Then comes P. S. 17 C of 9th March, 1732 A letter by one Ganga Ram reporting that Sardul Singh's gomashta of Narnoul had informed his master that *the Delhi Forces* consisting of 2,000 Sowars and Artillery had reached Narnoul 2 days earlier and certain Mahomedan local forces had *joined them.*

Then comes S. 41 of 14th March, 1732. Another letter, (2 days later than S. 40 and 5 days later than P. S. 17 C) by Sheo Singh writing to the same Official as in S. 40. We are marking time at Fatehpur. It is falsely reported that we are looting. In *the meantime a fight had taken place, the day before at Jhunjhunu* between the Delhi forces sent by Nawab Mozaffar Khan (which in S. 40 are stated to have reached Narnoal), and Sardul Singh. The fight was apparently inconclusive or not pressed, for we do not hear how it resulted. What Sheo Singh does say about these Delhi forces is that: "The forces consisted of 2,000 men in arms and people say

that further forces are coming those already here. If half t comes towards our side you kindly help us by writing to t Officers". Such a remark clear that it was Sheo Singh's vent Jaipur's. Apparently they had one sum of Rs. 30,000 for th ses of their forces and had tak booty by way of recovery of t penditure.

He then goes into the arran for paying up the arrears due Maharajah and the loans due Khattris, Bankers, for which ha to be met by a mortgage and a Cash payment or by hostage however, have not been furnish concludes by saying that there i hension of the collection of larg in that neighbourhood.

We get no documents showi the Jaipur Maharajah despatch troops or any instructions abou they were to meet the enemy c attitude they were to take up. only get letters stating what they doing and asking for help in stall the Delhi forces.

This would not be the case if th conquest was being undertaken half of Jaipur. We would undo get letters from the Jaipur Mal intimating the despatch of assista

villages of Udaipur. But even if one deducts Rs. 5,000 for these additions it still shows a rise in the tribute of about Rs. 20,000 paid by the new owner of Jhunjhunu, Sardul Singh, and represents a substantial advantage to Maharajah Jai Singh who, as set out in this paragraph of the Report, had a three years ijara at the time from Nawab Mozaffar Khan.

The next State paper is S. 45, an undertaking written by Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh. The great importance of this document is that under it Sheo Singh mortgages his 4 pattis Katrathal, Juliasar, Sihot and Patoda, the southern part of the present Sikar, for the Rs. 30,000 to be paid to Nawab Mozaffar Khan, the Rs. 50,000 Peshkash payable to the Maharajah and the Rs. 62,000 due to the Maharajah and the Bankers. If he was only a sub-lessee to collect the tribute on behalf of the Maharajah of Jaipur why should he mortgage his private property? The Katrathal villages are noted as mortgaged for the peshkash and the Jamiat Kharch, the expenses of the expedition. If it was not his venture why should he mortgage his own villages for this payment?

By this undertaking the whole income of the newly acquired property is in the first instance to be applied

5,000 for Babai and 27¾ villages of Udaipurwati (See P.S. 52 and 54).

It is not at all certain whether the tribute was Rs. 52,000/- in 1731 as stated in the report. The State Paper P. S. 27 shows that in 1730 A.D. Bohra Hemraj stood surety for Sardul Singh for Rs. 19,000 in respect of 1/3rd of the ijara and for Rs. 35,000/- for ½ the ijara of Jhunjhunu. From this it seems that the whole ijara was for 70,000. It is possible that proprietorship of the Jhunjhunu Territory was in a state of flux in 1731 and therefore the tribute in that year could not be collected in full.

There are further State papers which go to prove the proprietary right of the Thikanedars in Panchpanah Singhana, P.S 137. Pahar Singh, the adopted son of Akhey Singh, grandson of Sardul Singh, writes in 1745 A.D. "Whereas the entire share held by Akhey Singh has been bestowed on me by Shri Ji." This ofcourse refers to the acknowledgment of succession which has to be obtained by every Thikanedar. It proves that the proprietary right of the Sardul Singh family was recognised by the Jaipur Maharajah.

P.S. 148 shows that when Bakhat Singh in 1745 A.D. misunderstood the order of the Maharajah to mean that

77. This Sardulsingh was the leading landholder in Udaipurwati, where he held 8½ villages, and was of sufficient local prominence to secure the inclusion of 15½ villages of that parganah in the Ijara which he took for Jhunjhunu. He was also, according to local tradition which is duly recorded by Tod (III. 1423), at

Darbar". Clearly reinstatement to his ancestral domains on furnishing security. Nothing to do with a sub-ijara.

P.S. 251. In 1763 A.D. Nawal Singh and Kesri Singh promise to pay on account of "one taluqa" of Paragannah Jhunjhunu, Narhar, etc.

P.S. 162. Is of 1764. Therein Nawal Singh and Kesri Singh recite that "whereas certain villages of Pargannah Singhana are held *in permanent zamindari* by all us brothers." .... A clear reference to proprietary rights.

P S. 265. Is a document of 1764, written by Bhopal Singh "I promise to pay Rs. 50,403/6/- on account of "my taluqa" of Jhunjhunu and Narhar, etc

All the above papers are clear indications that the proprietary rights of the Sardul Singh descendants are recognized and admitted by the Jaipur State. This will be apparent to any one who examines these papers.

77. The State Paper P. S. 45 notes Sardul Singh as havingh 27¾ villages. It is not clear why he is here said to have only 8½ or to have taken the ijara for 15½.

The Report gets very near to agreeing with the argument of the

not to interfere in each others properties and to refer any future disputes that may arise to the Maharajah's decision.

The Report fails to notice how crucial this paper is. Unless it is a division of territorial rights it is nothing and it is quite impossible to consider that these two Chieftains referred to the Maharajah a matter of no moment. From the correspondence which has been referred to in the reply to S. 76 it is clear that Sheo Singh and Sardul Singh were acting together and jointly writing the results of their proceedings.

In the end a question has arisen as to what their respective rights are in these territories and without a doubt they have appointed the Maharajah of Jaipur their arbitrator and accepted his decision.

This paper, even if standing alone, would go far to prove the contention of the Thikanedars of ownership of this territory being with them. A similar paper has been put up with the Sikar series of state papers.

79 Sardulsingh died in 1742; the area covered by his Ijara was brought under direct (khalsa) management owing to arrears, and his son Zorawarsingh undertook not to interfere with collections

79. This paragraph refers to another very important set of documents. Sardul Singh had died and owing to arrears due to Jaipur State and Loonkaran, a banker, the Panchpana

until the *full* arrears had been realized (P S. 128) Eventually in 1744 Nawal-Singh, another son of Sardulsingh, was given his father's Ijara — the State incidentally undertaking to establish his possession by force in case his brothers opposed it (P. S. 130) — but we have evidence in the same year of an Ijara assessment of Rs. 1,05,600 for the Jhunjhunu and Narhar parganahs levied, in five equal shares of Rs. 21,120 each, from the five sons of Sardulsingh (P S 134 & 135). These figures are to the present day the ultimate basis of the State demand from Jhunjhunu and Narhar; and from this period, therefore, may be dated the formation of the Panchpana.

area was brought under direct (Khalsa) management owing to the arrears of tribute due from it.

Zorawar Singh undertakes on behalf of himself and his brothers, except Kishan Singh, not to interfere with collections until the full arrears have been realised. But he stipulates that his own people and those of Loonkaran will make the collections of the income. It is apparent that unless they had proprietary rights there would be no occasion to take any undertaking from them. Nor would Zorawar *Singh be able to stipulate that collections* would be made by his agents and those of the Banker who presumably had been the surety for him. Further, what right had Zorawar Singh's relations against whose interference he also gives an undertaking? It is as clear as possible that the family had proprietary rights by inheritance on the death of Sardul-Singh and the eldest son, Zorawar Singh, is giving this undertaking not to appropriate any of the income, which he collects, to their private use, until the arrears are paid. Zorawar Singh was the son of Sardul Singh by his first wife *and* Nawal Singh *and* his *other* brothers were by his second wife. It is possible that the Jaipur State was dissatisfied with Zorawar Singh's dealings and so gave the contract for the tribute to Nawal Singh and his brothers. The

sureties are a bit doubtful about Nawal Singh's brothers standing in his way and so they make it a condition of their suretyship that the State should establish his authority. P. S. 130. These very facts prove that the family of Sardul Singh have an established hereditary proprietary right and cannot be removed even if unsatisfactory. The ijara can be given, of course, to any one, but, as already shown, it is always best to give it to one of the local landowners and this is an instance of a change from one of the landowners to another. But even if an entire stranger were given the ijara or contract to collect the tribute, that would not have any effect on the proprietary rights of Sardul Singh's sons.

There are some more very important papers on the question of proprietary title to these lands P. S. 311 — 316. Baisakh Sambat 1836 (April 1779 A. D.). Nawal Singh had died and his eldest son Narsinghdas seized possession of the whole of his father's estate. These are letters sent from Jaipur State to every one of the members of Sardul Singh's family stating that they ought to have observed the custom prevalent from the time of Sardul Singh of equal division of the property and that Narsinghdas has no right to the whole estate. The State will enforce this right if necessary. The Darbar wishes to have things done in accordance with the old usage. The

family must not fight with each other. "The Turks (Mahomedans) are approaching, so all your Sardars should be united and joined with the Darbar's forces when they (The Turks) arrive."

These six separate injunctions to the various members of the family to recognise the custom and each other's rights in the property left by Sardul Singh show that the State very clearly recognised that the proprietary right in this area was in Sardul Singh's family and not in the Maharajah of Jaipur. The thing is too plain to be capable of any other meaning.

80. This summary, based on the State papers for the first 18 years of Maharaja Jaisingh's and Ishwarsingh's administration of Jhunjhunu and Narhar, makes it perfectly plain that the story of independent or sovereign conquest by Sardulsingh cannot be substantiated. The first subordinate Ijaredar on Sawai Jaisingh's behalf was a Baniya; and it is only by a gradual process extending over several years that *the prescriptive claim of the Sadhanis to* the Jhunjhunu-Narhar area was established

80 For conclusive proof of the Panchpana Singhana Thikanedars' rights in this new Territory having been that of proprietary Chieftains, as opposed to mere sublessees, there can be nothing stronger than the existence of proprietary grants made by them from time to time. If the Chiefs have all along, beginning with Sardul Singh, been making grants of *the proprietary interest in the Land, they* must have been from the time of their initial conquests more than sublessees. Such grants give a complete refutation to the theory of the Thikanedars being mere sublessees of Maharajah Jai Singh. It must be carefully borne in mind that it is not suggested for a moment that the Thikanedars did not take subleases or subijaras of Maharajah Jai Singh's right

to collect the tribute of their area. That is admitted. It has further been shown in the earlier part of this Reply that they were given the subijara because they were the proprietors. It has also been shown *that by a proper construction of the* State papers referring to this area the two ancestors acquired by conquest the Northern half of the present Sikar—then known as pergannah Fatehpur--and the Panchpana Singhana area, Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana, known as Panchpana Singhana. It has been shown that it was a clan conquest and made by these two Shekhawat Chieftains for themselves and that there were no Jaipur troops or Jaipur leaders employed in the conquest and that the two Chieftains had proprietary rights in the areas just South of the newly acquired territory.

It is the fitting complement of this position of personal acquisition of territory that the records should prove that they are found making grants of the proprietary interest in these lands. It is also to be remarked that at no time during these 200 years, 1733-1934 A.D., are there any grants made in this territory by the Jaipur State. Taking only the earlier period, the first 50 years after the conquest, we produce a list of 20 grants in the Junjhunu area, 1731-1775.

List of some of the grants made by the Shekhawats between 1731 and 1775.

---

(1) Baisakh Badi 9 Sambat 1788.

Parwana of Shardool Singh. The villages of Dahelsar and Sonasar are from old in 'Nankar'—maintenance grants—of Maluk Chand Qanoogo. "There will be no sort of trouble in my amal" Shardool Singh is styled as Banda-i-Dargah.

(2). Jeth Sudi 5 Sambat 1788.

Parwana of Kunwar Zorawar Singh. The village of Delsar was given to Maluk Chand in the time of Ewaz Khan. The cultivators should now pay to Maluk Chand more than they formerly paid to him

(3) Katik Sudi 2 Sambat 1788.

. Grant Rajshri Shardool Singhji 501 bighas of land in Lohagar is granted to Mahant Purshottamdasji for Bhog of Shriji The land originally belonged to Hazur Diwanji. Signed by Karam Chand by the order of Shri Durbar.

(4). Jeth Badi 2 Sambat 1788.

Grant by Shardool Singhji:— Shardool Singh went for Darshan of Shri Gopinathji in Bindraban and so he presented the village Gopinathpore for Bhog of the Deity The land of this village formerly formed part of Parasrampura Signed by Karam Chand

(5). Kartik Sudi 15 Sambat 1791.

Grant by Shardool Singh:— 80 bighas of land near the house, 101 bighas outside the village near Ghorakhandi, 101 bighas in Bagar—granted to Swamiji Rupdasji for Bhog of Thakurji.

Sighed by Kammuji Sah. This patta is renewed after inspecting the previous one granted by the Pathans

(6), Kartik Badi 2 Sambat 1792.

Grant of Zorawar Singh:—Two wells gifted to Mahant Goverdhan Dasji for *Bhog of Shriji.*

(7). Jeth Sudi 13 Sambat 1797.

Grant of Shardool Singh:—The Dungarmal and Mayachand are granted the land of the town which belonged to Fateh Chand.

(8). Baisakh Badi 12 Sambat 1797.

Grant of Shardool Singh:— The village Sultansar is granted to Charan Das.

(9). Chait Sudi 12 Sambat 1798.

Grant by Shardool Singh:— Kutubpura village is granted to Moharam Charan. Signed by Karam Chand by order of the Hazur.

(10). Bhadawa Sudi 5 Sambat 1799.

Grant by Rajshri Zorawar Singhji;—
501 bighas of Udawas granted to Purohit Garib Dasji in Charity.

(11). Sawan Sudi 2 Sambat 1808.

Grant by Nawal Singhji, Bhakhat Singhji, Kesri Singhji:— A well along with 11 bighas of land in Jhunjhunu called "Khudi" is dedicated to the Deity.

(12). Asarh Badi 7 Sambat 1810.

Grant by Kesri Singhji:— 51 bighas of land granted to Lachhiram Joshi as Udak

(13). Mah Badi 6 Sambat 1812.

Grant by Bhopal Singhji:— 20 bighas of land and a well in Dhanuri village granted in Udak to Swami Mayaramji. Signed by Gangabishan.

(14) Katik Badi 15 Sambat 1812.

Grant by Nawal Singhji:— Temple of Shri Gopinath granted to Swami Lachhmandasji. Signed by Motiram Shah.

(15). Poh Sudi 4 Sambat 1815.

Grant by Pahar Singhji:— 101 bighas of land in Togra granted to Swami Mayaramji

(16). Sawan Badi 2 Sambat 1815.

Grant by Hathiramji:— 25½ bighas of land in Arnoli with a well granted to Swami Mayaramji in Udak. Signed by Narsingh Joshi.

(17). Puh Sudi 6 Sambat 1818.

Grant by Hathiramji, Salam Singhji, Maha Singhji, Daulat Singhji, Chatar Singhji, Arjun Singhji and Dhiraj Singhji:— Khera of Jhunjhunu granted to Swami Mayaramji.

(18). Asarh Badi 6 Sambat 1825.

Grant by Nawal Singh:— 200 bighas of land in Ghoomansar granted to Nandoo Pandit.

(19). Mah Badi 12 Sambat 1836

Grant by Nawal Singh:— 41 bighas of land in Nawalgarh dedicated for Bhog to the Deity.

(20). Bhadawa Sudi 3 Sambat 1832

Grant by Newal Singh.— 101 bighas of land dedicated to Swami Deva Dasji.

The list of the Sikar grants will be produced by the Sikar Thikanas in its separate report. If a list of all the proprietary grants made up to date were produced they would amount to at least three or four hundred. It is impossible to think that all these transactions were secret or illegal, for in that case they must have been questioned and set aside long ago. On the contrary, these old papers are still preserved by their owners with the greatest care as proof of their rights. The existence of these documents and ownerships thereunder are such strong positive proof of the case for the Thikanedars that it is impossible after this to class them as mere sublessees who have by degrees usurped a position in which they never started. But if they are shown to have started in and all along held proprietary rights, then the case made out in the Report falls to the ground, as there is no alternative case made that they

were proprietors but never independent Tributaries. The small amount levied on their territorial possessions proves that they were not treated as ordinary subjects but were all along treated as Independent Chieftains, who paid a tribute. These Independent Chieftains did not disdain, any more than their Suzerain the Maharajah of Jaipur, to take contracts for the collection of the tribute due on their areas, which on realisation was paid over to the Maharajah. As it paid the Maharajah to make such collections, it is only reasonable to presume that they increased the amount they had to collect to such amount as made it profitable for them also.

81 After the formation of the Panchpana by the subdivision of 1744, one of Sardulsingh's five sons, named Akhaisingh died without issue. Instead of his share being divided equally between his four brothers, it was partitioned only between three of them born of the same mother — Zorawarsingh, Sardulsingh's son by another wife, obtaining no part of Akhaisingh's share The assessment for Jhunjhunu had already been fixed at Rs 70,000 with Rs 25,000 for Nathar (including certain villages in Udaipurwati) and Rs 10,000 for certain other villages — making a total of Rs. 1,05,000 This demand was accordingly, after Akhaisingh's

81. As early as 1744, as this paragraph shows, the Sardul Singh family are found distributing the share of Akhai Singh, the deceased son of Sardul Singh, among his brothers by the same mother. It is impossible to say that they were merely distributing the right to collect the tribute. They partition the land, and the amount that each has to collect and pay over is set out. This is not a case of Jaipur State selecting any particular individuals whom it pleases as its sublessees, but a case of persons coming in as sharers of the proprietary right in accordance with the law of inheritance applicable to the deceased.

death, subdivided as follows :—

Kishansingh	1/5th plus	1/3rd of 1 5th	Rs	28,160
Kesrisingh	Do	Do	,,	28 160
Nawalsingh	Do	Do	,,	28 160
Zorawarsingh	1 5th		,,	21 120
		Total	Rs	1 05,600

The new partition came into force, apparently, about 1755, but the clearest statement of it appears in the Accounts of 1763 (P S. 260) The original position is detailed in the Accounts of 1764 (P. S. 269 A).

82 Meanwhile in 1750 the State took from the Mogul Authorities an ijara for the Singhana parganah, which had previously been "badshahi khalsa" (P S 166) This parganah, however, was sublet not to all, but only to certain selected, descendants of Sardulsingh The assessment was fixed at Rs. 1,50,000 from 1755 (P S. 197). Possession remained with Sardulsingh's family; but different members of that family were chosen as Ijaredars at different times, until finality was reached in 1769 In that year Bhopalsingh, son of Kishansingh, secured one half share of Singhana parganah, while the other half was shared equally by Nawalsingh and Kesrisingh (P. S 295). The basis of this family distribution is traceable to the present day. It is important to note in connection with the subdivision of the Singhana lease, first, that Zorawarsingh's interest is not represented at all; and, secondly, that only one branch of Kishansingh's family obtained a share in it — the paharsingh branch being excluded. It is clear, then, that this partition of Singhana was settled on a basis independent of that underlying

82. It appears that as regards the tribute of Singhana it was taken on contract from 1750-1754 by Bakhat Singh, the eldest son of Zorawar Singh, and Bhopal Singh, son of Kishan Singh. They are both grandsons of Sardul Singh. P. S. 161 and P.S. 185 Then Bakhat Singh presumably has died and his son Arjun Singh in 1756 joins Bhopal Singh in taking the sublease from Jaipur State P.S. 197. This arrangement continues until 1762 P.S. 246. It is admitted that the descendants of Zorawar Singh and of Pahar Singh the brother of Bhopal Singh ceased to enjoy any proprietary rights in Singhana pergannah after this year. They appear to have been dispossessed by Bhopal Singh The proprietary interest in the pergannah then was as follows—half with Bhopal Singh and other half with Nawal Singh and Kesri Singh and according to the usual

the partition of the Jhunjhunu-Narhar Ijara The latter alone constitutes the Panchpana proper. I can offer no explanation for the exclusion of Zorawarsingh's and Paharsingh's interest from the Singhana lease.

83 Besides the above-mentioned lease of the Singhana parganah and of the Jhunjhunu and Narhar parganahs with certain villages in Udaipur and elsewhere, the family of Sardulsingh obtained "Bhom", or "Zamindara", or proprietary rights in eleven or twelve villages of the Singhana parganah, for which they were assessed to an additional Rs 10,000 (P S 274 see also para. 116 below) Of this sum, Rs. 6,000 was payable for seven villages by the families of Bhopalsingh, son of Kishansingh (Rs. 1200) Nawalsingh (Rs 2 400) and Kesrisingh (Rs 2,400), all of whom shared in the lease of the Singhana parganah. These figures, therefore, duly appear in the general Ijara account of the Singhana parganah (see Appendix L. Part I) The remaining *Rs 4,000, which was assessed on the* four or five Bhom villages of Zorawar-Singh and Paharsingh, who had no share in the Ijara of Singhana parganah, seems to have been omitted altogether from the revenue demand The old State papers (P S 274) indicate that Rs 800 should be realized on account of Bhom villages from the descendants of Arjunsingh, the grandson of Zorawarsingh; Rs 1,600 from the descendants of Hathisingh, the son of Zorawarsingh; and Rs 1600 from the descendants of Paharsingh These items are unimportant; and it has not been

practice the sublease for the tribute is taken by the three Chiefs who own the land (see P.S. 261 and 265). It is not a case of selecting ijaredars but of the proprietors of the period taking the ijara.

83. The existence of the Bhom villages in Singhana proves that from an earlier date Sardul Singh's family had some Watan villages in this Perganah on which a part of the tribute was separately assessed.

possible to ascertain precisely which are the villages originally held in Bhom tenure, for the very existence of such villages in Singhana has been forgotten I would not, therefore, recommend any further inquiry in this regard

84 The Sadhanis were always unruly; and, living at a distance from the State capital, were quick to take advantage of any relaxation of control I have already referred, in paragraph 26 above, to Mirza Najaf Khan's efforts between 1773 and 1782 to bring Jaipur once more under the Mogul Emperor's authority With the assistance of the Naruka Chief of Macheri (Alwar), his General, Najaf Kuli Khan, overran the whole of Panchpana-Singhana; and we can safely infer from the State papers (P S 311-316) that it was dissensions among the Sadhanis themselves and their dubious loyalty during the minority of the Maharajas Prithwisingh and pratapsingh that made the task of the Imperialists an easy one After the death of Mirza Najaf Khan, Maharaja Pratapsingh re-established his authority in Panchpana-Singhana, but it was again greatly undermined by the operations of Mahadji Sindia, whose troops made direct revenue collections from Shekhawati in 1792 (S 183), taking one-third of the realizations for their expenses before crediting the balance towards the tribute which they claimed from the State The growing weakness of Pratapsingh necessitated such direct collections; but it also encouraged the insubordinate tendencies of the Sadhanis, who now in the Time of Trouble paid very unpunctual allegiance to the Jaipur Darbar

84. This paragraph refers to the recrudescence of the power of the Moghul between 1773 and 1782. It was a natural consequence of this that the tribute which was an Imperial right was collected by the Emperor through Najaf Quli Khan and Thakurs Bagh *Singh, Nawal Singh, Hanwat Singh and* Suraj Mal are given a furman in 1774 A D that they are to pay a fixed Mamla and promising them suitable recognition if they continue obedient. They also came to an agreement (dated January, 1775) among themselves to divide the tribute equally between them. Both these will be produced—A translation is given below:—

Be it noted that Thakur Nawal Singh, Bagh Singh, Hanwaut and Suraj Mal who have been in attendance have been given distinction and honour. It is promised —God and his apostle stand witnessess to this promise—that on condition of their sincerity, alliance, obedience and attendance and the punctual payment of the fixed Mamla, they will be raised higher and higher in esteem and distinction and no back-biting of their enemies against them will be attended to.

Seal of
Zafaryab Khan
1128 A. H

Seal of
Najaf Quli Khan Bahadur.
1128 A H.

Written this 9th day of Moharram the 16th year of Julus

SHRI RAMJI.

Seal of Thakur Nawal Singhji	Seal of Thakur Bagh Singhji	Seal of Suraj Malji.

Written on behalf of Raj Shri Nawal Singhji, Bagh Singhji, Hanawat Singhji, Surajmalji.

As the 'Mamla' and 'ded' has been settled with Najab Kuli Khanji, this should be paid according to our shares The three shares are to be paid according to the shares in land What remains to be paid for Zorawarsingh and Paharsingh's share should be paid by us, the three sharers The money realised from their lands is to be distributed in three shares. We have here given undertakings for payments. If there be any error in amount, we will settle the account on reaching Jhunjhunu Whoever creates trouble or dispute in the matter about the past events, will be excommunicated.. Jaitsinghji, Ugarsinghji, Guiabsinghji, Rajsinghji, Bigatsinghji— These five Sardars will jointly settle the accounts This will be acceptable to us all We five shall also accept their decision about the shares in Parganah Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana The undertaking for payment (Nisan) given by any one will stand even for interest.

Dated Mah Sudi 3 Sambat 1831 (January 1775 A. D) He who will not abide by the decisions of the arbitrators will be excommunicated. He who goes against the arbitrators will be against Shriji...

Rajshri Nawalsinghji. The above is correct.

Signed Mayachand by order.

Rajshri Bagh Singhji. The above is correct.

Signed Jagannath by order.

Rajshri Hanawat Singhji Suraj Malji The above is correct

Signed Chaudhary Bhagat Ram by order of Masters.

If Thakur Nawal Singhji does not obey the arbitrators, Bagh Singhji, Hanawat Singhji and Suraj Malji are one

If Bagh Singhji does not obey, Thakuran Nawal Singhji, Hanawat Singhji, Suraj Malji are one

If Hanawat Singhji Suraj Malji do not obey, Thakuran Nawal Singhji, Bagh Singhji are one.

SHRI RAMJI

Seal of Thakur Nawal Singhji.	Seal of Thakur Surajmalji

Written on behalf of Rajshri Nawal Singhji, Hanawat Singhji Surajmalji

As the 'Mumalati' and 'Peshkash' has been settled with Najab Kuli Khan, we must pay the same according to our shares on that date About the shares of Zorawar Singhji and Pahar Singhji what will have to pay will be paid by us alone with Baghji...We shall jointly take 'Nisan'.
None shall retract from this

Dated Mah Sudi 3 Sambat 1831 (Jan 1775 A D)

Signed Maya Chand by order of Hazoor.
Signed Chaudhri Bhagat Ram by order of Hazoor.

In the following year, 1775, Nawal Singh is given a Mansab of 3000 zat and 2000 Sowars and the title of Bahadur.

In 1778 the Imperial forces take possession of Narnol, in which Pargannah Shekhawatee comes, and thereon the Shekhawatts pay the tribute direct to the Emperor. There are 8 receipts from Imperial Officials covering the period from 1778 to 1789, which will be produced. For translation see Appendix B.

In 1781 half Singhana and his share of Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Udaipur are recognised as the Territory belonging to Bagh Singh by the Emperor Shah Alam. This Farman bears the seal of *Bakshi-ul-Mulk Najaf Quli Khan and* will be produced. The translation is as follows :—

Seal of
Bakhshi-ul-Mulk Saifuddaulah
Najaf Quli Khan Bahadur
Muzaffar Jang
Fidwi Badshah Ghazi, Shah Alam.

Be it known to the Chowdhris, Kanungos, Mutsaddis and cultivators of half pargana Singhana, Jhunjhunu, Narhar and the villages of old Taluqa of Udaipur belonging to Thakur Bagh Singh that whereas the above mentioned parganas have now with effect from Rabi 1189 Fasli been granted and fixed in the estate (Jaidad) of Rafat and Ali Nishan Thakur Bagh Singh under the orders of Hazoor, therefore you should consider the said Thakur as permanent master of the estate and act according to his will and wish. It is incumbent on the Thakur that he should keep the subject happy and contended with his good behaviour and make every effort in

the cause of their inhabitation and improvement of cultivation and land revenue. No neglect should be shown. The land revenue should be assessed and realized in proper time and included with his own collection and the matter duly reported to the office of the Sarkar. The above orders should be strictly complied with.

Dated 1st Jamadi-ul-Awwal Jalus Year 23.

(1781 A D)

Prior to this, however, they were very roughly handled by Najaf Quli Khan Three of the chieftains, Nawal Singh, Bagh Singh and Suraj Mal, were taken captives and carried off until ransomed for many lakhs of rupees. Tod Vol. III page 1397. It does not seem that it was the growing weakness of Partap Singh so much as the exhibition of power by other greater personages that compelled the Shekhawats to pay their tribute in other directions

85. Serious friction developed between the State and Baghsingh of Khetri and Shyamsingh of Surajgarh in 1797 Khandela and Rewasa were plundered by the Sadhanis, while Baghsingh withheld the revenue demand The disturbance was widespread, as the State papers show (P S 342-347 & 355); but eventually, so far as the Panchpana was concerned, the old figures of assessment were restored Details are given in the account sheets for 1803-4 The basic assessment remained the same as before (Rs 1,05,600), and the deductions, under the head "patta" for military service, are the same as those entered in 1795 (P S 336) before the

85. In this paragraph the construction of "patta" as meaning a grant for military service is set up for the first time, but it is repeated in many subsequent paragraphs. It is as well to correct this error as early as possible.

The meaning of "Patta" or grant in the matter of the deductions totalling Rs. 18,000 - can be conclusively shown by a consideration of the following papers The earliest paper is a parwana of recognition of succession by

trouble started. It was, however, about this time that the Sadhanis ceased finally to render military service to the State. Nevertheless the deductions on this account from the Panchpana demand—namely, Rs. 18,000 (raised from Rs 12,000 to 18,000 in 1812 for Kishansingh's interest; Rs 12,000 for Kesrisingh's interest; Rs. 12,000 for Nawalsingh's interest; and Rs. 2,500 for Zorawarsingh's interest- continued as before and remain in force to the present day.

Bagh Singh to the tazim privileges enjoyed by his deceased brother Bhopal Singh. Lastly it states that Rs. 12,000/- on account of Patta and Rs. 3,500/- on account of inam shall continue to be deducted. It is issued in March, 1773 A.D. by the Jaipur Ministers, Dewans Prohit Bal Kishen and Sewa Ram. (Khetri paper No. 1.).

The next paper Khetri 2 deals with the same 12,000 - and is written three days later, March 1773 A.D., by the same Jaipur State Ministers to the Jaipur Mutsaddis in Shekhawatti instructing them that in accordance with the orders of the Maharajah they were to permit the deduction of Rs. 12,000/- from the Malma payable by the three grandsons of Sardul Singh. Translations of these two papers are appended. Khetri Nos. 1 and 2.

The next paper is P.S. 332, dated November 1791 A.D. It is an undertaking by Bagh Singh Shekhawat that as no service is now being rendered the deduction on account of "Patta Chakri" will no longer be made. This shows that Service Patta was denominated Patta Chakri.

It has been shown above that Rs. 12,000 - was accepted as a good deduction in 1773 A.D. It is also admitted in Paragraph 85 of the Report that this deduction of Rs. 12,000 - was

increased by Rs. 6,000/- in 1812. The papers that deal with the additional allowance of Rs. 6,000/- show the head under which the whole deduction was allowed. The first paper is dated August, 1812. It is a parwana by the Jaipur State Minister Misser Sheo Narain to the amil at Shekhawati that under the order of the Maharajah 'chhoot' a deduction in "Bhayan Serishta" *i.e*, in the allowance to brethren, has been increased by rupees six thousand for Rajah Abhey Singh. The same parwanah is found in the Jaipur State papers and is P.S. 385, dated August, 1812.

It will be remembered that with reference to Babai Rajah Abhey Singh wrote in 1822 that in 1812 he had attended Rajah Jagat Singh's marriage with the daughter of the Rajah of Jodhpur. The additional allowance of Rs. 6,000/- in Bhayan Serishta was obviously due to the very friendly relations that existed between them in that year, *vide* Lt.-Col. Lockett's Journal page 92.

There is one more paper that is very important in as much as it is a Khas Diwani Huzuri Patta *i.e.*, a grant bearing the seal of the Maharajah himself, and it refers to the analogous deduction of Rs. 10,800/- as a deduction on account of the practice amongst

brethren as of old. S.181. A very extraordinary rendering of the phrase is found in paragraph 107 of the Report; a deduction "in lieu of the usual service rendered by the Thikanedar's relations"! The words are "Bhayan Serishta rakhe muafiq sadamand Rs. 10,800/-—" literally, "deducted on account of Brethren according to old usage."

It is quite impossible to give the words the meaning assigned to them in the Report. Taking the meaning of the words as a grant on account of Kinship, it is quite natural for it to be entered in later years as a Kansa or maintenance allowance, for the two are very similar, but it would be rather inexplicable for a service deduction to be subsequently entered as a maintenance allowance. In 1843 the matter of these deductions of Khetri came before Major Thoresby. The Rs. 12,000 were not contested by the Jaipur Officials, but the further deductions of Rs. 6,000 and Rs. 2,000 were. The Khetri people produced State papers covering these allowances and after going into all the facts and papers submitted, Major Thoresby held that Rs. 6,000 was a good claim, but that the Rs. 2,000 were a personal grant to Kunwar Bakhtawar Singh and therefore terminated with his death. It is noteworthy that no Jaipur State Official argued for one instant that these were deductions on account

of service and that no service was now rendered therefore they were no longer admissible. The deductions that were no longer admissible on this ground had been stopped in 1791 as shown by P.S. 332.

At that time, 1843, the Khetri Rajah was a minor so he cannot have used undue influence with the Jaipur Officials. This decision has never been questioned by any Maharajah since it was given.

The deductions therefore referred to in SS. 85—88 and Appendix L of the Report of Rupees 18,000 are incorrectly classed as concessions given for service. They have all along been allowed and are not open to resumption now on the only ground suggested *viz*: as being grants for military service no longer rendered. Of the Rs. 18,000, rupees 12,000 were an old standing allowance in 1773, as the paper produced of that year itself shows. The Rs. 6,000 were never objected to by Sir David Ochterlony though he was resident from 1818 to 1826. They were upheld in 1843 by Major Thoresby. It would be quite contrary to the declared undertaking stated in the treaty of 1818 that the dependencies were to be regulated by long established usage to try and resume these grants now.

In the matter of the rights of the Khetri Rajah Bahadur, there is an

brethren as of old. S.181. A very extraordinary rendering of the phrase . is found in paragraph 107 of the Report; a *deduction* "in lieu of the usual service rendered by the Thikanedar's relations"! The words are "Bhayan Serishta rakhe muafiq sadamand Rs. 10,800/-—" literally, "deducted on account of Brethren according to old usage."

It is quite impossible to give the words the meaning assigned to them in the Report. Taking the meaning of the words as a grant on account of Kinship, it is quite natural for it to be entered in later years as a Kansa or maintenance allowance, for the two are very similar, but it would be rather inexplicable for a service deduction to be subsequently entered as a maintenance allowance. In 1843 the matter of these deductions of Khetri came before Major Thoresby. The Rs. 12,000 were not contested by the Jaipur Officials, but the further deductions of Rs. 6,000 and Rs. 2,000 were. The Khetri people produced State papers covering these allowances and after going into all the facts and papers submitted, Major Thoresby held that Rs. 6,000 was a good claim, but that the Rs. 2,000 were a personal grant to Kunwar Bakhtawar Singh and therefore terminated with his death. It is noteworthy that no Jaipur State Official argued for one instant that these were deductions on account

of service and that no service was now rendered therefore they were no longer admissible. The deductions that were no longer admissible on this ground had been stopped in 1791 as shown by P.S. 332.

At that time, 1843, the Khetri Rajah was a minor so he cannot have used undue influence with the Jaipur Officials. This decision has never been questioned *by any Maharajah since it was given.*

The deductions therefore referred to in SS. 85—88 and Appendix L of the Report of Rupees 18,000 are incorrectly classed as concessions given for service. They have all along been allowed and are not open to resumption now on the only ground suggested *viz*: as being grants for military service no longer rendered. Of the Rs. 18,000, rupees 12,000 were an old standing allowance in 1773, as the paper produced of that year itself shows. The Rs 6,000 were never objected to by Sir David Ochterlony though he was resident from 1818 to 1826. They were upheld in 1843 by Major Thoresby. It would be quite contrary to the declared undertaking stated in the treaty of 1818 that the dependencies were to be regulated by long established usage to try and resume these grants now.

In the matter of the rights of the Khetri Rajah Bahadur, there is an

imposed on Panchpana-Singhana; and shows how this gross original assessment was (except for Rs. 50,000 at first deducted for Jagirs from the Singhana demand but altogether omitted from the accounts of 1803 onwards distributed among the branches of Sardulsingh's family in 1818 Part II of the Appendix gives detail of the Thikanas, their holders and their assessments in Panchpana-Singhana at the present day, according to the information supplied to me by the Revenue Department Part III of the Appendix gives, for each of the seven main branches of Sardulsingh's family mentioned in the accounts of 1818, the additions and deductions which connect the basic with the present assessment. For example, the first Thikana, held by Abhaisingh in 1818, is that of Khetri That Thikana now consists of a one-sixth share of the Jhunjhunu-Narhar Ijara (1/6th of Rs 1,05,600 = Rs 17,600, to which 1½% or Rs 264 was added), a half share of the reduced Singhana Ijara (Rs 50,000) together with two villages (names unknown) held in Bhom or Zamindara right (Rs. 1,200) On this conglomerate estate, therefore, the basic assessment in 1818 was Rs 69,064 (P. S 403) The demand today is Rs 31,257/5/-, as shown in Part II of the Appendix

88 The first page of Part III of Appendix L supplies the *detailed additions* and deductions which, in the case of the Khetri Thikana, link the present day demand of Rs. 31,257/5/- with the basic assessment (Rs 69,064) of 1818. The

main deductions for Khetri are as follows :—

Item 2 Rs 18,000 subtracted for "patta" — a concession given originally in lieu of service, but for which no service is performed

Item 3 Rs. 2,000 subtracted for Pateli — on account of the Estate-holder's presumed performance of the functions of Patel

Item 4 Rs 3,500 subtracted for Khetri since 1767 when that village was given by the Darbar in Inam.

Item 5 Rs 2,400 subtracted for the village Khandwa presumably a deduction similar in character to that for Khetri.

Item 8 Rs. 7,289/4 substracted for "Bharna"— on account of the conversion into cash of a certain proportion of the assessment which was formerly payable in kind.

Item 11 Rs 2,441/15/6 substracted on account of the conversion of Madhhopuri into Jharshahi coin

Item 6, 7 and 10 are deductions for religious and charitable purposes while items 1 and 9 cannot now be explained

89 The connection between the present demand and the basic assessment of 1818 has been worked out for all the other Thikanas of Panchpana-Singhana on the same lines as for Khetri The calculations are shown in detail in Part III of Appendix L The state Departments have

hitherto had no knowledge of these additions and substractions They have accepted the stereotyped demand, and have realized it without any attempt either to check the detail from which it is derived or to enforce any corresponding obligation from the Thikanas in return for the concessions given

90 The question arises whether the Thikanedars of Panchpana-Singhana (including Khetri) enjoy a permanently fixed assessment. I have found no reference in the old State papers to the grant of an ijara *istimrar* to any Thikanedar of Panchpana-Singhana, but the fixity of the basic assessment, with but a single reduction for Singhana of Rs. 60,000, strongly suggests that that assessment has now acquired a permanent character In my opinion, however, it is only the basic assessment — what I have called the gross assessment in Appendix L — that is permanently settled The Thikanedars themselves claim that the Mamla, or net demand, is permanently fixed; but I can find no authority for this contention It is true that the additions and deductions detailed in Part III of Appendix L, which connect the basic assessment with the present Mamla, have acquired a conventional stability. Most of the deductions are justifiable — such, for example, as those on account of Inams, or for signal service rendered to the State in the past, or for religious or charitable purposes, or for payments in cash in lieu of payments in kind, or for differences in exchange between Madhopuri and Jharshahi coin; but, where a reduction was originally made for continuing service and that service is

90. There is no reference, says the report, in the old state papers to the grant of an ijara istimrar to any Thikanedar of the Panchpana Singhana. This should have been a clear indication that the Status of the Thikanedars is not that of ijaredars in perpetuity. The whole argument for discontinuance is based on a misconception of the allowance under the heading Patta. It would require much stronger proof than has been adduced to show that this Rs. 18,000, was a grant in lieu of military service, as against all the papers herein referred to, before a case for showing cause could be said to be made out for going behind the long-established usage.

no longer rendered, it does not seem to me that mere lapse of time can entitle a particular Thikanedar to a permanent reduction on that account in his basic assessment The onus of proof rests upon him to justify it — and, if he fails to do so, the State would be justified in refusing to continue the particular deduction. I conclude, therefore, as regards the Panchpana-Singhana Thakurs, that their basic assessment is permanently fixed and that the additions thereto and deductions therefrom have a conventional stability; but that, in the particular case where deduction is made under the head "patta" — which here signifies a reduction on account of service to be rendered — the Thikanedar concerned may reasonably be called upon to show cause why this deduction should not be discontinued

91. As regards the territorial rights of the Thikanedars of Panchpana-Singhana, it is manifest, both from the proved stability of their tenure and from the extreme leniency of their assessment, that their position is very different now from what it was when the Panchpana was first formed in 1744 Their title is permanent and hereditary and their basic assessment is fixed, they all hold on what may now be fairly regarded as a perpetual lease, and the character of their tenure in the land can best be expressed by calling them Istimrardars Though liable to succession *nazaranas* under well-defined rules, they are now exempt from the old irregular levies of *peshkash* and the like These are valuable concessions common to all; and they represent a definite growth in the territorial rights

91. Section 91 is apparently intended to be a concession, but it is in fact an unwarrantable confiscation of proprietary and independent tributary Status and a grant of the position of perpetual lessees in return. This is to give the go by to the long-established position of the Thikanedars which, as shown, dates from the commencement of the Thikanas in 1730.

of the Thikanedars. Just as the original Ijaras (never, so far as I can learn, defined as *istimrari*), which Sawai Jaisingh took from the Mogul Officers 200 years ago, enured to the benefit of Maharaja Jagatsingh, so that the British Government in 1818 recognized him as the Absolute Ruler of his territory and his dependants according to long-established usage ", so also by a long-standing convention the subordinate Ijaredars have, in their degree, developed into property holders of indisputable strength

92 I would make it clear that although I classify all the Thikanedars of Panchpana-Singhana as Istimrardars, I do not for a moment suggest that all their powers and privileges are identical The *territorial* title of all of them, however, rests upon a common basis — they are all descendants from a common ancestor, whose rights they have partitioned as a common inheritance amongst themselves. This element of uniformity in the origin and growth of their land-tenure can be best expressed by giving them all, *quâ* land-holders, the common title of Istimrardars In the matter of special powers there is a wide difference between Khetri and the other Thikanas; but this is a separate question which will be more conveniently dealt with in a later section of the report

92. The same reply as to S. 91.

93 It remains to comment on the fragmentation of the property which Sardulsingh's descendants obtained in the Panchpana-Singhana — a subject regarding which much misconception exists. Colonel Brooke in his history, published sixty-five years ago, wrote: "Since the time of

93. This paragraph calls in question the statement of Colonel Brooke that the Jaipur Government, about a century ago, took advantage of some dispute among the descendants of Sardul Singh to introduce the custom of equal

Shekhji the Shekhawats have increased vastly in numb rs To break their strength, the Jaipur Government, about a century ago, took advantage of some dispute amongst them to introduce the custom of an equal division of real estate amongst the male children on the death of a parent." This statement has no more authority than the same writer's story of the conquest of Shekhawati; and it is contradicted by Tod who plainly states that Sardulsingh "shortly before his death divided the conquered lands between his five sons...... . Besides the patrimonies assigned to the five sons of Sadhu, he left the districts (*sic*) of Singhana, Jhunjhunu and Surajgarh to be held in joint heirship by the junior members of the stock" (Tod III 1424-5) Nevertheless Sir Alfred Lyall followed Brooke in attributing a Machiavellian policy to the Jaipur Ruler He writes: "The consolidation of these septs (of Mallani and Shekhawati) has been greatly hindered by the policy of the Chiefs of Jhodhpur and Jaipur who, being unable to control these unruly communities, became alarmed lest they should unite under one head and become formidable independent rivals With much the same motive as that which, according to Sir Henry Maine, induced the English to gavel the lands of the Irish Papists and make them descendible to all children alike, the Jaipur Chiefs used all their influence to push forward among the refractory sept the custom of an equal division of the land among males on each succession — using it as a wedge to split up the groups as they began to form" (Lyall, 253).

division of their estates among the male children. The Report says that it has no more authority than the same writer's story of the conquest of Shekhawati. Colonel Brooke was writing his History after many years service as a Political Officer in Jaipur, a position which gave him access to all the Jaipur State Papers, the Political Agents' records and to persons in a position to give him accurate information, who are now long dead and gone. To assume of an officer of his rank and political status that he made statements without any authority for them, is, to say the least of it, a little presumptuous. The other statement as to the conquest of Shekhawatti which is treated with the same lack of courtesy has been completely justified by the Papers now produced from the State Records, and is supported by the statements of other historians, by Lt.-Colonel Lockett who wrote, some 35 years earlier, a report on Shekhawatti, and by tradition It is therefore extremely probable that at the time Col: Brooke wrote this statement, it was borne out by information from sources not available to the writer of the Report. Nor is there necessarily any contradiction involved in the statement made by Tod that shortly before his death Sardul Singh divided the conquered lands between his five sons and left Singhana, Jhunjhunu

and Surajgarh to be held in joint heirship by the 4 younger sons of the stock. It is quite likely that Sardul Singh was aware that Jaipur was abetting friction between his sons as to their rights on his death and foresaw the internecine struggle that was likely in the result to bring to naught all the efforts of his life. To prevent future trouble he made a disposition of his Territories that would remove all grounds for dissension. That historians do not reiterate every statement made by one or other of them dealing with the same period is not uncommon, but that does not show that either of them is not to be relied on because a statement found in one is not in the other.

It would be curious to have such a statement gratuitously invented by Colonel Brooke. It is almost certain that such a view was generally held on substantial ground. It must be remembered that Sardul Singh himself originated from a congeries of petty Chiefs existing throughout Manoharpur, Khandela and Udaipurwati, all of whom had owed no allegiance to Jaipur but had enjoyed an individual Status recognized by the Moghul Court. That he should divide his very extensive domains into 5 different Chiefships was consonant with the position in the surrounding territories, a position prevailing among the various petty principalities in Germany

about the same time. In Shekhawatti, at any rate, the creation of such separate independent States would be in keeping with custom and unlikely to meet with any difficulties as long as the Emperor's tribute remained undiminished.

94. It is generalizations of this kind that have confused the issues in the past The real facts are very simple. The Shekhawats of Udaipurwati, who originally (according to Tod) held that tract as a Thikana subject to the ordinary rule of primogeniture and from whom Sardulsingh sprang, were already subdividing their estate long before the time of Sawai Jaisingh. We possess, in a document of 1732, a list of the 49 villages of Udaipurwati. Sardulsingh is shown as holding 8½ villages, while the remainder are distributed among some 26 other Shekhawats, for each of whom a separate assessment is recorded (Ud: 13). When Sardulsingh and his family secured the lease, first, of Jhunjhunu and then of Narhar and later again of Singhana, it was natural that they should, in distributing their landed property amongst their heirs, from the very first apply, as they had previously applied to their home estate, the ordinary Hindu custom The very name Panchpana is conclusive evidence of the truth of this contention Colonel Brooke and Sir Alfred Lyall were misled by their own imaginary story of clan conquest, to which a reference is made in paragraphs 117 and 118 below. Such conquest involved the ideas of Chiefship and Primogeniture, and, therefore, the operation of the normal

94. The clan conquest has been very definitely established both by the Statements of many British Officials and historians and by the State papers now produced, notably S. 40 F. That Sardul Singh divided his Territory among his sons is no argument for the theory that it was not conquered by him by the aid of the clans. There is absolutely no ground for the view "That Sardul Singh and his earlier descendants regarded themselves as mere property holders and therefore divided their inheritance in the ordinary way." It is further certain that they have never been treated by the British Government or the Jaipur State as "mere property holders".

law of succession among the Shekhawats seemed to them anomalous. "The tenures in the Shehkawat country have this peculiarity that, excepting two or three great estates, all holdings are regularly divided among all the sons on the death of the father — the rule of primogeniture, which prevails in nearly all estates of Rajputana, not having been admitted here " (R. G. H. p 141) Now that the story of clan conquest is exploded and we know that Sardulsingh and his descendants were introduced simply as Ijaredars on behalf of the Jaipur Ruler, the difficulty disappears; and the appropriateness of the ordinary law of Hindu succession becomes apparent Their enforcement of the ordinary Hindu Law is, in fact, a stading admission by the Shekhawats that they did not enter Shekhawati as a conquering clan Had they done so, their Chiefs would have inevitably established themselves in estates transmitted by primogeniture Sardulsingh and his earlier descendants regarded themselves as mere property holders; and therefore, divided their inheritance in the ordinary way

95 That the Jaipur Rulers regarded this process of subdivision with satisfaction may be assumed, for it tended to prevent the growth of a single authority in Shekhawati hostile to their own; but the story of their active pursuit of such a policy, in defiance of a custom favouring primogeniture, is completely refuted by the facts. For at least three-quarters of a century before Colonel Brooke wrote, the leading houses in Shekhawati had succeeded in checking the fragmentation due to their own customary system of

95-97 These sections do not require any reply. The subdivisions referred to have never had the effect of reducing the Status of the Thikanedars. The smallness of some Thikanas has in certain matters led to intervention, but that does not affect their Status.

succession. Khetri and others assert that, whatever the custom of the sept may be, their family custom favours primogeniture Colonel Brooke (Brooke p 9) notes that Shikar and Khetri are "the only estates which have escaped this ruinous subdivision—the first by the destruction of the minor branches who sought to enforce partition; and the latter by the want of issue beyond a single son in each reign" (*sic*) Such artificial evasion cannot, I venture to think, establish a family custom *in favour of primogeniture* Evidence can only arise when there are several equal heirs, and a settlement is made which gives the estate to one of them while conceding only maintenance rights to the others I have not yet been able to find a single instance in Panchpana-Singhana where one such heir has succeeded to a Thikana to the exclusion of another, with the explicit consent of the State and of the excluded party The unwillingness of the bigger Thikanedars to subject their Estates to subdivision is intelligible, but the fact remains that the indigenous custom of the Sadhanis is wholly in favour of equal partition between equal heirs.

96 I have already described how the partition of Jhunjhunu and Narhar (the Panchpana) was effected on one basis and that of Singhana on another This can give no idea of the present complexity of the subdivision of land in this tract The greater portion of it was, no doubt partitioned by whole villages; but, even though a number of villages formed the share of a single heir, that heir did not receive them in a compact block He received a number of scattered villages

which collectively constituted his inheritance Again, as subdivision continued, even the individual villages were broken up into shares, so that a number not of whole villages but of shares in scattered villages went to form the allotment of individual heirs. Yet again, there were villages which, from the first, were never partitioned as whole villages among the five sons of Sardulsingh, but each was held jointly by all the members of the family Important centres, such as Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana, were treated in this way After a time, when the co-sharers in such villages became numerous, partitions seem to have been effected, resulting in an extreme degree of fragmentation It is said that there are eight villages in Panchpana-Singhana which are still held by all Sardulsingh's descendants

97 The general position, therefore, is bewildering; and the difficulty is increased by the absence os any adequate record of the subdivision of properties. Regular Matmi or Mutation cases are decided at each important succession; but the Matmidars are a select company. Besides the authorized Matmidars, other persons, who have obtained separate shares by private arrangement, are allowed to pay in their shares of the land-revenue direct to the Tahsildar—the payment so made being credited, not in the name of the actual payer, but in that of the appropriate Matmidar. I at one time hoped that the list of actual payers would disclose the extent to which property in Shekhawati had been subdivided; but even this is not the case. There are

also partitions in which the co-shares pay their revenue jointly through a single representative; and of such partitions there is no hint or record in the official papers. I have, with considerable difficulty, had a map prepared for Panchpana-Singhana which exhibits the fragmentation of the country, so far as this is authoritatively recognized by Matmi or Mutation cases. I cannot vouch for the correctness of the map, but I beleive it is sufficiently accurate for my purpose—which is simply to give a pictorial representation of how the landed estates have been broken up.

PART II—SIKAR

98—122 Omitted

PART II—SIKAR.

98-122. As this Thikana has filed a separte Reply it is not necessary to make out a case for it here. Its case is supported by a great number of papers. Fundamentally its case is the same as that of the Panchpana as regards origin.

PART IV — BABAI

123 The Khetri Raja's tenure in Babai taluq needs careful study. Babai was one of the Five Mahals taken on Ijara by Sawai Jaisingh from the Nawab Muzaffar Ali Khan in 1730 (P S 30-34); and it was, at first, held in subordinate Ijara from the State by a family of Rajawats (P S. 117, 176, 305 and 308) Subsequently the Khetri Thakurs sought possession of the tract; obtained a parwana for it from Najaf Kuli Khan in 1781 (see paragraph 26 above): and in 1791 are found holding it from the Darbar under a Khas Mohar Parwana (P S 335) The Rajawats were again in occupation from 1798 (P S. 353-4 368, 370 and 381), but in 1812 Babai was forcibly seized by the Khetri Raja; and his family pessess two letters of 1814 from the Minister, Misra Sheonarayan, granting them the 22 villages of Babai, with the "Qasba, Zakat, Kanat, Dariba and Cesses", from generation to generation (P S. 386-7, I L and M). Up to this time the tract had been regularly assessed at Rs. 4,500 per annum, to which was usually added a levy of from a half to one and a half lakhs of rupees, as *nazarana*, at each renewal of the grant

PART IV.—BABAI.

123. After having seen the Imperial Records and had time to further consider the position disclosed by the various papers produced, it is possible to make a clearer statement of the Khetri Rajah's claim to Babai.

The original title of the then Chief of Khetri, the exalted and of high rank Thakur Bagh Singh, (Rafiat Wa Awali Nishan in the Farman) is a farman of the Moghul Court under the seal of "Bakshi-ul-Mulk Saifuddaulah Najaf Quli Khan Bahadur Muzaffar Jang Fidwi Badshah Ghazi Shah Alam 1191 Hijri, 19 Jalus".

This grant conveyed to him the entire pergannah of Babai in Jaidad. The Chaudhris, Qanungos, officials and peasants are to consider him the permanent owner (Saheb Jaidad mustaqil) and to act according to his good will, wishes and advice. He is to continue to pay the proper Revenue assessed thereon.

Dated 11th Jamad-ul-Awal Jalus Year 23 (1781 A.D.).

This being a title from the Emperor was superior to a title from any other source. Again in 1790 A.D. corresponding to 1205 Hijri, Thakur Bagh Singh obtained another Sanad from the Mahratta granting him 4 pergannahs including Babai.

At this date the position of the Mahratta was as apparent agent but actual successor to the Moghul Emperor. This title is recognised by Jaipur State in 1791 and the Mutsaddi is told to collect the tribute for 1791 from Bagh Singh (Babai Appendix 3).

It seems however that one of the Rajawats, from which sub-clan of kachhwahas come the Maharajahs of Jaipur, regained possession of Babai in 1798, which they had owned, apparently, for some years in the period between 1740 and 1776, as they took sub-leases of the tribute then.

But that the title conferred on Bagh Singh was a proprietary title is proved by the fact that from 1785 - 1799 Thakur Bagh Singh made various proprietary grants in Babai, a list of which is set out in the ("Babai Appendix" 16). Even during the years 1798 - 1812 the Khetri Rajah enjoyed some portion of the income of Babai as the entries in the Babai account books show. These books still exist (Babai Appendix 15)

There is strong reason to think that the Rajas of Khetri have at different times attached very great importance to their title under these Imperial grants and considered them the basis of their title. The next period begins with the year 1806 and goes up to 1822.

124. That the Khetri Raja forcibly occupied Babai in 1812 is beyond all question. An inscription in the Baghor fort at Khetri, placed there in 1897, records that 1812 "Maharaja" Abhaisingh of Khetri won a victory over the Jaipur Rajawats of Dhula and captured Baghor; and a despatch from Sir David Ochterlony, dated the 1st of July 1818, confirms the fact that Abhaisingh's original entry into possession was irregular A Grand Darbar was held on the 30th of June, 1818, for the purpose of obtaining the signatures of the leading Thakurs of Shekhawati to the Articles of Agreement, previously signed by other Thikanedars on the 21st of that month, which involved their surrender of all misappropriated lands The Tahkurs of Shekhawati were headed by Bakhtawarsingh, the son of Abhaisingh of Khetri, who protested that he did not hold any lands for which he had not obtained regular grants from the Maharaja "I asked", writes Ochterlony, "at what time such grants had been obtained, and, on his (Bakhtawarsingh's) replying 'about five or six years since', I told him that I did not consider the *Maharaja at that period to have had a* will of his own; that I know the land in general had been first usurped and then measures adopted with the Manager of the day to obtain a Sanad.. ......Nearly all the khalsa lands of the State had got into the hands of individuals, most of whom could urge the same plea The Maharaja had, therefore, resolved to resume all, and the object of his being summond was only to inform him of his determination" (see App. II, part III). Though Babai is not specifically mentioned

124. From Lt.-Col. Lockett's "Report on Shekhawatti" of 1831 we get the following facts at page 91. He gives there the history of the tenure of Babai.

Ochterlony's despatch, from which the foregoing quotation is taken, there is no doubt but that the Khetri Raja's forcible *occupation of that taluq was the subject*-matter of the discussion he reports Babai taluq was resumed, included in the khalsa and given on a three-years lease to Raja Abhaisingh at Rs. 40,000 for 1818-19, Rs 42,000 for 1819-20 and Rs 44,000 for 1820-21—Sir David Ochterlony being, presumably, content to secure a substantial assessment under a temporary lease, which asserted the Maharaja's rights without necessitating the immediate eviction of the Khetri Raja (P.S. 396) This document was executed on the 30th of June, 1818, on the same day as that of the Grand Darbar at which Ochterlony 'negotiated the the Settlement It need not be supposed that the grant of a three-years lease to Abhaisingh was inconsistent with the inclusion of Babai in the State khalsa, for the Khalsa land was, at this period, generally farmed out in this way on short-term leases. Moreover, in a subsequent despatch of the 22nd of August, 1818 Ochterlony specifically reported to the Government of India that "what has been effected is the resumption of large tracts from the superior Thakurs that could not be concealed"

EXTACTS from Lieutenant Colonel Lockett's Journal and Report on Shekhawattee, in April 1831

Besides the three Pergunnahs of Jhoonjhnoo, Nurhur and Singhana which the descendants of Sardool Singh hold immediately from Jyepoor as Tributaries, in the manner above described, there is another district called Bubae which the Khetree Raja farms from the Raja of Jyepoor, the history of which may be given in a few words

Madhojee Scindia as already stated, gave the Purgunnah of Bubae which consisted of 22 villages* to Bagh Singh, on the completion of the fortification of Khetree † for which he was only required to pay quit rent of 4,500 rupees per annum. Bagh Singh having many years afterwards given offence to Raja Purtab Singh Jyepoor, the Purgunna was seized on by order of the Raja, and restored to the *Rajnauts* from whom it had been forcibly taken by Scindia.

* It lies six koss from Khetree.

† About fifty four years ago

When Raja Juggut Singh in 1806 proceeded with his whole force against Jodhpoor, he was accompanied by Abhye Singh, who had succeeded his father Bagh Singh, and the Raja was so pleased with his conduct on that occasion and during the whole of his Arduous contest with Man Singh, that he promised to restore to him the Purgunna of Babae on condition of his paying him a Nuzurana of one lac of Rupees This promise was made while the Army were investing Jodhpoor. On the return of Abhye Singh to Jyepoor with the Army, he gave a note of hand for the Money to Rae Chund, the Minister, but it so happened that the Minister was disgraced and imprisoned the very day after and the Note or Hoondee was returned On the third day after, the Minister's imprisonment, he was put to death by order of the Rajah The transfer of Babae remained therefore unsettled

About six years after this, in 1812, on the celebration of the marriage of Raja Juggut Singh with the daughter of the Raja of Jodhpoor* the negotiation for Babae was renewed and the Raja agreed to transfer of the Pergunnah to him for the amount of Nuzzarana originally agreed on but he suggested at the same time that Abhye Singh should take possession of the Fort of Bubae with his own Troops—he having, at that particular time, none he could well spare. The money to the amount of a Lac of Rupees was remitted by Abhye Singh to the Jyepoor Treasury, through Misser Sheo Narain.

*The ceremony took place at [illegible]

The rent originally demanded by Madhojee Scindia, and paid to him and subsequently to Raja Purtab Singh, namely Rs. 4,500, remained unaltered.

On the birth of the present Rajah Jye Singh, in 1819 Sir David Ochterlony the Resident, proceeded to Jyepoor and in a general assembly of the Thakoors, demanded (on the Raja's name I suppose) the restoration *to the Raja's Khalsa of all usurpations and grants obtained from the State, in the period of violence and anarchy which had intervened since the year 1805.* Among others, Koour Bukhtawur Singh, who was present, on the part of his father Raja Abhye Singh, was desired by the Resident to direct the restoration of Babae and notwithstanding the explanation offered by the Koour respecting the original assignment of the Pergunnah to

his Grandfather and the large sum paid to the late Raja for it, as well as the heavy expense incurred by his Father in capturing the Fort of Babae, which he estimated at 50,000 Rupees, the resumption was insisted on by Mohun Ram Nazir the then Minister but after a prolonged discussion, it was finally settled that the district of Babae should continue in the possession of Rajah Abhye Singh, provided he agreed to pay his future an increase of Rupees 39,000 or in other words a fixed rent of Rs 44,000 per annum This was agreed to though not without great reluctance.

Another attempt was made by the Minister in 1822 to increase the rent of Babae On that occasion Major Stewart, who was Political Agent at Jyepoor, addressed a Circular Letter to all the Principal Chieftains and Thakoors of the State, on the subject of the Marauding system throughout every part of Shekhawatee, and urging them in strong terms to adopt effective measures for putting it down. In his Persian letter to Raja Abhye Singh, a copy of which is now before me, he informed that Chieftain that the Jyepoor Minister had been offered a higher rate of rent for Babae. and he asked him whether or not he would agree to hold the district on the increased rate proposed Raja Abhyee Singh's reply is as follows.—
"With respect to increasing the rent of Babae, I have to inform you that the expense of my Troops, during the two years I remained on service, with the late Raja (Juggat Singh) in his War with Jodhpoor amounted to Rupees 11,000 that I paid one lac (100,000 Rs) as a *Nuzzurana* to the Maha-Raja for the grant of Babae, and that it cost me Rs 50,000 to take the Fort of that Purgannah Formerly there was a fixed tribute for that Purgannah of Rs 4,500 per annum in the time of Raja Suwae Jye Singh, Madho Singh and Partaub Singh, which was regularly paid Afterwards, during the administration of Mohun Ram Nazir, who was and enemy of mine, instead of 4,500 Rupees 44,000 was fixed as the Tribute, while from another brother Chief, who had paid Rs 60.000 he only asked Rs * 90,000 per annum Now you write to me that the farmers are ready to give more, I must refer you to my engagement wich will be found in the Records of the Government Be pleased to read it, and act according to what is there written".

*Rao Raja Luchmun Singh of Seekur for the district of Khundela

"I have always considered myself as a dependent of the Company—You will learn further particulars from Thakoor Bagh Singh"

*This is Bagh Singh Larkhani of Khetree whom the Dewan of Nawab Fyz Mahmud Khan, marked out as the Chief of all the Sulheydee and Larkhanee plunderers

The above letter is dated the 22nd January 1822 It seemed to have satisfied the Political Agent and the Minister Rawul Beri Saul, as the correspondence ceased on the receipt of it, and no increased rent was afterwards demanded for Babae

It appears from what has already been stated, that the Kheetree Chieftain is in the double relation of a *Tributary* and a farmer to the Raja of Jyepoor. For his share of the lands of Jhoonjhnoo and Nurhur, seized on originally by his ancestor Sardool Singh, he pays a fixed sum of money annually in the shape of tribute, as a *redities* of acknowledgment to the Jyepoor Government.

For the district of Babae which he holds in farm as an *Istumraree*—grant, he pays a quit rent, which has varied from 4,500 to 44,000 Rupees per annum. The former possessions are hereditary, the latter are revokable at will, though it must be acknowledged that the resumption of Babae under all the circumstances of the case as already detailed, would be a harsh if not an unjust measure.

At all events the resumption of the districts, during the Raja's minority and by a Minister so little respected as Jhota Ram could never be viewed in a favourable light by any of the respectable Chieftains and Thakoors of Shekhawatee. Jhota Ram however at the instigation of his colleague, Thakoor Sham Singh, meditates this measure, the Dhabae and the Khetree people in general, seem to have no doubt.

Page 98

In the beginning of the year 1818, when the several independent States were entering into Treaties of alliance with the British Government, Raja Abhye Singh, deputed his son Koowar Bukhtawar Singh to Delhy with the view of prevailing on the Resident to admit him among those Minor Chiefs who were about to be placed under British protection The services of Abhye Singh were known and acknowledged, but the relation subsisting between him and the Raja of Jyepoor, rendered such an arrangement at that particular time, a matter of some delicacy, although the course pursued by the Jyepoor Government, in refusing to to enter into the general system of Policy rendered necessary by the course of events, would have fully justified it Sir Charles Metcalfe accordingly explained to Bukhtawur Singh the true state of the case, but to satisfy him and his father Abhye Singh, that their interests should not be forgotten, he delivered to him a Tusullee Namah, or friendly letter of assurance, which was shown to me, by the Khetree Minister, and of which the following is a Translation

TUSULLEE NAMAH

Page 99

"As Raja Abhye Singh and Koonwur Bukhtawur Singh, have signified their wish to embrace the alliance of the British Government, and promise to act

in subordinate co-operation with it, in the same manner as they have heretofore acted with the Maha Raja of Jyepoor, it is therefore herein stated with reference to the known faithful attachment and friendly disposition of the said Raja Abhye Singh, and Koonwur Bukhtawur Singh, that if from any cause, the bonds of friendship and unity should not be established between the Maha Raja of Jyepoor and the British Government the said Raja Abhye Singh and his son Koonwur Bukhtawur Singh, and their descendents from generation to generation shall be considered as Allies of the British Government But in the event of an accommodation taking place between the Maharaja of Jyepoor and his son Bukhtawur Singh, shall continue as hereto-fore subordinate to the Raja of Jyepoor, although even in that case, the British Government will continue their protect and supporter (Hamee or Hafiz) and they and their descendents from generation to generation shall continue to enjoy its favours and bounty".

The above letter of friendly assurance was dated on the 21st of January 1818 when the dubious and evasive conduct of the Jyepoor Court, made it difficult to foresee what course of policy she would ultimately adopt On the 2nd of April following, however, a treaty between the Honourable East India Company and Raja Juhgut Singh of Jyepoor was concluded which was communicated by the Resident at Dehly to the Khetree Raja in a letter dated the 10th of the following month May, 1818, *of which the following is an extract*—"And you may rest assured that the British Government will continue in every way well disposed towards you, and *whenever your cause is just, afford you protection and assistance*"

The Khetree Government justly attach great importance to these letters and seem now to look confidently for the fulfilment of the promise, therein given, of protection and assistance, believing as they do, their cause to be just and reasonable

Bagh Singh having given offence to Rajah Pertab Singh of Jaipur, the pergannah, on the latter's orders, was restored to the Rajawats.

When Rajah Jugat Singh in 1806 proceeded with his whole force against Jodhpur he was accompanied by Abhya Singh, who had succeeded his father, Bagh Singh, and the Rajah was so pleased with his conduct on that

occasion and during the whole of his arduous contest with Man Singh that he promised to restore to him the Pergannah of Babai on condition of his paying him a Nazzerana of one lac of rupees. This promise was made while the army were investing Jodhpur. Abhye Singh gave a note of hand for the money to Rae Chand the Minister, who, however, was disgraced, and imprisoned and the note was returned. The minister was shortly after put to death and the transfer remained unsettled. About six years after this the two Rajahs were again on very good terms and Rajah Jagat Singh in 1812 married the daughter of Rajah Man Singh and negotiations about Babai were renewed. "The Rajah agreed to the transfer of the pergannah to Abhye Singh for the amount of Nuzzarana originally agreed on but suggested at the same time that Abhye Singh should take possession of the Fort of Babai with his own troops, he having at that particular time none that he could well spare. The money to the amount of one lac of rupees was remitted by Abhye Singh to the Jyepur treasury through Misser Sheo Narain. The rent originally demanded by Madhoji Scindia and paid to him, and subsequently to Rajah Partab Singh, namely Rs. 4,500, remained unaltered.

Col. Lockett then refers to the assembly of the Thakurs in June 1818 at which the Resident, General Ochterlony, desired Koour Bukhtawar Singh, who represented his father Rajah Abhye Singh, to restore the Babai grant "notwithstanding the explanation offered by the Koour respecting the original assignment of the pergannahs to his grandfather" (Bagh Singh) "and the large sum paid to the Rajah for it, as well as the heavy expense incurred by his father in capturing the Fort of Babai, which he estimated at 50,000 rupees. The resumption was insisted on by Mohun Ram Nazir the then Minister after a prolonged discussion. It was *finally* settled that the district of Babai should continue in the possession of of Rajah Abhye Singh provided he agreed to pay in future an increase of rupees 39,000, or, in other words, a fixed rent of Rs. 44,000 per annum. This was agreed to though not without great reluctance.

Another attempt was made by the Minister in 1822 to increase the rent of Babai." On that occasion Major Stewart, the Political Agent then, wrote to Rajah Abhye Singh. "In his Persian letter which is now before me, he informed that Chieftain that the Jyepur minister had been offered a higher rate of rent for Babai, and he asked him, whether or not he would agree to hold

the district on the increased rate proposed".

Raja Abhye Singh's reply is as follows:—"With respect to increasing the rent of Babai, I have to inform you that the expense of my Troops, during the two Years I remained on service, with the late Raja (Juggut Singh) in his War with Jodhpur amounted to Rupees 44,000 that I paid one lac (Rs. 100,000) as a *Nuzzurana* to the Maha-Raj for the grant of Babai, and that it cost me Rs. 50,000 to take the Fort of that Pargannah. Formerly there was a fixed tribute for that Pargannah of Rs. 4,500/- per annum in the time of Raja Swae Jae Singh. Madho Singh and Purtaub Singh, which was regularly paid. Afterwards, during the administration of Mohun Ram Nazir, who was an enemy of mine, instead of 4,500/- Rupees 44,000/- was fixed as the Tribute, while from another brother Chief, who had paid 60,000/- Rs. he only asked 90,000/- Rs.* per annum. Now you write to me that the farmers are ready to give more, I must refer you to my engagement which will be found in the Records of the Government. Be pleased to read it, and act according to what is there written."

*Rao Rajah Luchmun Singh of Seeker for the district of Khandela.

"I have always considered myself as a dependent of the Company — You

will learn further particulars from Thakoor Bagh Singh"

> * This is Bagh Singh Larhani of Khetree whom the Dewan of Nawab Fyz Mahumud Khan, marked out ass the Chief of all the Sulheydee and Larkhanee plunderers.

The above letter is dated the 22nd January 1822. It seemed to have satisfied the Political Agent and the Minister Rawul Beree Saul, as the correspondence ceased on the receipt of it, and no increased rent was afterwards demanded for Bubae.

It appears from what has already been stated, that the Khetree Chieftain is in the double relation of a *tributary* and a farmer to the Raja of Jyepoor. For his share of the lands or Jhoonjhnoo and Nurhur, *seized on originally by his ancestor Sardul-Singh* he pays a fixed sum of money annually in the shape of tribute, as a *redities* or acknowledgment to the Jyepoor Government.

For the district of Babae which he holds in farm, as an *Istumraree*-grant, he pays a quit rent, which has varied from 4,500 to 44,000 Rupees per annum. The former possessions are hereditary, the latter are revokable at will though it must be acknowledged that

the resumption of Babae under all the circumstances of the case as already detailed, would be a harsh if not an unjust measure.

At all events the resumption of the districts, during the Raja's minority and by a Minister so little respected as Jhota Ram could never be viewed in a favourable light by any of the respectable Chieftains and Thakoors of Shekhawatee, Jhota Ram however at the instigation of his colleague, Thakoor Sham Singh, meditates this measure, the Dhabae and the Khetree people in general, seem to have no doubt".

This long extract shows—

(1). That Rajah Abhye Singh had won the approbation of Maharajah Jagat Singh for his afforts on the latter's behalf in 1806 in the war with Jodhpur and was promised the restoration of Babai on a Nazarana of 1 lac as his reward. That this sum however was not paid as set out and the matter was therefore left in abeyance.

(2). That in 1812 on the celebration of the marriage of Maharajah Jagat Singh with the daughter of the Maharajah of Jodhpur the Maharajah agreed to transfer the Pergannah to him for the 1 lac nazarana originally agreed to but suggested that Abhye Singh should take possession of the Fort of Babai with his own troops. Considering that the

Rajawats who had possession of Babai had been put in by the previous Jaipur Maharajah and that they were of his own sub-clan of Rajawats ; that he would be engaged in all the arrangements and festivities consequent on his new matrimonial alliance, it was only natural that the Maharajah should stipulate that Abhye Singh should secure possession for himself. The taking of Babai was thereafter effected by Rajah Abhye Singh with his own forces, but it was not a forcible taking as it was with the permission and on the suggestion of his overlord, the Maharajah of Jaipur, and cost Rajah Abhye Singh Rs. 50,000. The due payment of 1 lac as nazarana as a condition of the grant was fulfilled That on these conditions and in such circumstances the making of the grant was a bona-fide transaction is clearly shown It was for good consideration and in restoration of a previous possession with title from the Moghul Emperor It was not, as Mohun Ram had, evidently, deliberately misled General Ochterlony to believe, a case of misappropriation so that the General said to Kunwar Bakhtawar Singh "I knew the land in general had been first usurped and then measures adopted with the Manager of the day to obtain a Sanad (Appendix H Part III Clause 3) That at some later date General Ochterlony learnt the true facts is evidenced by the fact that though he

continued to be the Resident of Delhi and Rajputana until 1825 and frequently came to Jaipur and stayed there for months together, he never made any attempt to oust Abhye Singh out of Babai inspite of his personal conversation about it and inspite of his much mentioned articles of Agreement of June 1818.

There are other papers which support the narrative of Lt. Col. Lockett written in 1831. There is P. S. 387 written by Misser Sheo Narain in September 1813 stating that a sum of 1 lac of rupees has been settled on account of Nazarana of Babai and the tribute at Rs. 4,500 of which Rajah Abhye Singh is given the ijara. The tribute in these later days was called "Mamla" and is so called in this paper.

The next paper to be referred to is the grant itself from the Maharajah of Jaipur bearing his seal. It states that the 22 villages of Pargannah Babai with all rights of Town, customs, mines, minting and all cesses are bestowed on Rajah Abhye Singh on a fixed Mamla of Rs. 4,500 which shall be paid from generation to generation.

There are three papers showing this grant. Two of them are of Katik (September) and the third of October 1814. The first is addressed to the Mutsaddi Jaipur Officials. The second

was to Rajah Abhye Singh, but bore no seal and he evidently considered this a flaw, for he gets a similar one in the next month bearing the Maharajah's seal. (Babai Appendix Nos. 9, 10, 11).

There is a paper of 1812 (P. S. 386 and Babai Appendix No. 7) a memorandum of the Jaipur (Huzuri) Personal Office which states that the title of Rajah has been granted to Abhye Singh, son of Bagh Singh Shekhawat of Khetri and adds Salaam was also performed on account of taluqa Babai. This must have been when Abhye Singh gave the note of hand to the Minister Rai Chand referred to by Col. Brooke and quoted above This was the year Rajah Abhye Singh captured the Babai Fort of Baghor, as stated in paragraph 124 of the Report. The conferment of the title of Rajah and the Salaam for Babai cannot possibly mean less than a permanent title to Babai at Rs 1,500 annually.

The grounds for this view may be summarised as follows —

1 That Abhye Singh had rendered 2 years military service in the field with his own troops in the war against Jodhpur, 1806 – 1808, which had cost him Rs. 44,000

2. The Nazarana of 1 lac of rupees which was paid in cash.

he writes to Abhye Singh saying very properly that he could not interfere with General Ochterlony's proceedings, but he was sure that the General would do what was right. If usurped, Babai would have to be given up. It is very probable however that Metcalfe did write privately to General Ochterlony, for inspite of all Ochterlony had said and done about Babai in 1818, in spite of the fact that he was frequently in Jaipur and stayed there for months at a time (See Brooke's Political History), that he was in the neighbourhood, prepared to bombard Rao Rajah Luchman Singh, when the latter, seeing this was imminent, took a lease of Khandela for 3 years in 1822, the General nevertheless employed no pressure whatever against Rajah Abhye Singh. A careful perusal of the Imperial Records shows that no attempt was made to coerce Abhye Singh in any way about this Taluqa by either Sir David Ochterlony or Captain Stewart.

That the question of Babai was taken up by Captain Stewart and reference made to it by him to Sir David the Records show, but what suggestion the latter made to the former, we do not get, probably because they were confidential and possibly oral. At any rate, it was only four days later that a Khas Mohur Parwana was issued under the seal of the young Maharajah from the Regent Rani's

125 Maharaja Jagatsingh died in December, 1818; and on the 12th of May 1819, all the Thakurs of note, and among them Raja Abhaisingh, were required to sign an "arzi", promising that, until the minor Prince, who had succeeded Jagatsingh, should arrive at years of discretion, "none of us will appropriate any of the khalsa lands for our own use" (Aitcheson III p. 70). The Government of India, in passing orders on these proceedings on the 3rd of June, 1819, wrote to the Resident "It is obvious that any alienation of the khalsa, or principality lands, would directly diminish the revenue of the Raja and eventually affect the payment of the tribute to which we are entitled by treaty. It is, therefore, of the highest importance to prevent any measure of that description to any serious extent; and H. E the Governor-General in Council deems it indispensable that, *during the minority of the Raja*, the Regency refrain from granting away any portion of the principality lands or other sources of revenue without previous communication with the Resident; and that any grants of that description, made without such previous communication, from the death of Jagatsingh to the majority of the present Raja, be considered null and void...You will, of course, withhold your concurrence from any proposals to make grants of considerable value till have received the sanction of Government.

Office giving the Taluqa of Babai to Rajah Abhye Singh on an annual payment of Rs. 44,000/-.

125. Such a grant cannot be said to in any way offend or go counter to the instructions given by the Governor-General in Council that the resident should see that no alienations were made by the Regency "which would directly diminish the Revenue of the Rajah and eventually affect the payment of the tribute to which we are entitled by treaty".

As shown above, the annual payment had been very arbitrarily rised from Rs. 4,500/- to 44,000/- in 1822 on a grant that had bona fide been made for perfectly good consideration in 1814.

Now in 1822 the Khas Mohur Parwanah makes this high enhancement permanent. It does not therefore "diminish the Revenue of the Rajah". Nor can it be assumed for a moment that it was done without previous communication with the Resident, because it certainly was the subject of reference between Captain Stewart and the Resident, Sir David Ochterlony, but, as said above, the Records do not disclose the Resident's views on this grant.

Considering that it is a grant in the time of Jhota Ram who had a

very marked hostility to the Khetri Rajah, as Col: Lockett sets out (Lockett p. 76; Brooke p. 55), it can hardly have been given as a favour. Indeed, the language of it is very peremptory and harsh, clearly showing that there was to be no concession of the excessive enhancement and that it was only on this high payment that Rajah Abhye Singh could have it permanently. It will be *remembered that the three year* lease had expired in the middle of 1821 and therefore there were six months during which the negotiations went on before the Khas Mohur Parwana was given, which was ample time for the Political Agent, Captain Stewart, to consult the Resident, Sir David Ochterlony.

126 Notwithstanding the Settlement of 1818, the Arzi of 1819 and the orders *of the Government of India just quoted*, the Raja of Khetri, on Magh Sudi 3, Sambat 1878 (= January, 1822 A.D.), once more took over the Babai taluq on the *strength of an unusual document obtained in peculiar circumstances*. This document purports to be a Khas Mohar Parwana from "Maharaja Dhiraj Maharaja Shri Sawai Jaisinghji", *then two years old*, to Raja Abhaisingh Shekhawat of Khetri; and it declares that the 22 villages of Babai taluq, including the "Qasba, Zakat, Kanat, Darиba *and* Bab Sawab", are hereby granted to Raja Abhaisingh, who may consider them as included in his Bapoti (hereditary) villages. *An annual payment of* Rs. 44,000 is prescribed—this being the last rental

126. It is shown that the transaction was in no sense a clandestine transaction merely because an office copy of the perwana was made over to the Jaipur Official by a female servant from the *Regent Rani's Office. The power behind the Rani, Jhuta Ram, from his strong* hostility to the Khetri Rajah, would have seen to the latter not getting anything in the nature of a concession and would have reported it without fail to the Political Agent if it had been a *concession. But apart from that, when* a copy was sent to the Jaipur Official for filing, it is beyond question that the translation was accepted as bonafide and genuine.

due under the expired temporary lease An office copy of this parwana, found last December in the private house of the hereditary Parwana, and Kharita Navis bears the following footnote : "This parwana is handed over, under verbal orders, to Raj Badaran, Rupa " (P. S. 410 and Appendix R). The true character of the transaction is thus disclosed It was apparently negotiated, behind the Resident's back, through the notorious Rupa Badaran, the slave-girl through whom Jhutharam Saughi retained his influence over the Bhatianji Maji. The circumstances of the transacation make it clear that the dead was invalid. The Maji had neither the authority from the Government of India nor the right in her own person thus to circumvent the agreements of 1818 and 1819. It was held by the Government of India at the time, as it is sound Hindu law to the present day, that a widow, whether in her private capacity or when exercizing the powers of a Regent, has only a life-interest in the property or territory that she administers The Maji had no power to alienate the rights of the minor on whose behalf she acted as guardian and trustee Moreover, under the orders of the 3rd of June 1819, the transaction, having been carried out without previous reference to the Resident and without the sanction of the Government of India was null and void.

To this must be added the fact that Captain Stewart continued to be the Political Agent and Sir David the Resident for another three years, but never a word is said either about the Khas Mohur Parwana or about the terms on which the Khetri Rajah continued to hold the Taluqa. It is impossible to argue that such a big property was forgotten by both these Officers when one reads of the much smaller properties which were resumed.

Jhuta Ram continued the principal man in the Rani's counsels. None of these three would forget the matter The Report has a very peculiar explanation It is hard to credit it as seriously put forward. Because the female servant of the Rani was a notorious bad character, therefore, when it is shown that she is the female who brought it from the Zenana the Jaipur Office, it is quite certain that the grant is vitiated by chicanery and fraud Such a theory requires more than the flimsy basis of the female attendant's character to explain away the validity of the grant from proper authority. Nor can it be said that the Maji had not the authority of the Government of India nor the authority in her own person. That the grant was never questioned by the Resident or the Political Agent is sufficient to to show that she had all authority that was required from that quarter. That

she was the Rani Regent and as such was the recognised head of the State is the law both in Jaipur and throughout Rajputana. (Tod Vol. iii p. 1370.)

Even Rawal Beri Sal, whom the British Government were forcing her to keep as her Chief Minister, was not prepared to have her deposed. (Brooke pp. 38 to 50). Such an important matter cannot be done without the knowledge and concurrence of the British authorities, as the Report assumes.

Incidentally, it may be noted that the Governor General addressed the Maharajah when three years old (See Mehta's Lord Hastings and The Indian States p. 150 note 6). The Seal would be the seal of the Maharajah even at two years of age.

127 It is interesting now to turn to Colonal Lockett's full account, in his journal of 1831, of the "district called Babai, which the Khetri Raja farms from the Raja of Jaipur" His account is written, of course, from the Khetri point of view, for Colonel Lockett "was watched throughout; and it was impossible for him to call impartial witnesses" (Col: Alves' despatch of 27 June, 1835); and we have here, therefore, a very fair instance of the manipulated Thikana history which has been, throughout the British period, the mainstay of the *Jaipur Thikanedar.* We are told that Khetri originally obtained Babai from Sindia, who took it from the Rajawats; and that "many years

127. Lt. Colonel Lockett is said to have been watched throughout, but Jhota Ram was having constant interviews with him, and Beri Sal could not be kept away from him. They were not impartial witnesses, it is true, but they would be partial to the Jaipur State and would not fail to give Captain Stewart full information about this Khas Mohur Parwana. The "Manipulated Thikana history" theory cannot be used at this point when Col: Lockett had the documents which he quotes before him. It is to be remembered that the Parwana is four days later

afterwards". Maharaja Pratapsingh, being offended with Baghsingh of Khetri, restored Babai to the Rajawats During the war with Jodhpur for the hand of Krishna Kumari, Abhye Singh rendered Jagatsingh such signal service that he was promised the Restoration of Babai, but the promise was not fulfilled till six years later, when Jagatsingh "agreed to transfer the parganah to him . .. but suggested at the same time that Abhaisingh should take possession of the fort of Babai with his own troops, he having, at that particular time, none he could well spare . ...In 1819 [sic] Sir David Ochterlony proceeded to Jaipur and, in a general assembly of the Thakurs, demanded (on the Raja's name I suppose) the restoration to the Raja's khalsa of all usurpations and grants obtained from the State in the period of violence and anarchy which had intervened since the year 1805. Among others, Kunwar Bakhtawarsingh was desired by the Resident to direct the restoration of Babai, and. notwithstanding the explanation offered,... ..the resumption was insisted upon.. .. but, after a prolonged discussion, it was finally settled that the district of Babai should continue in the possession of Raja Abhaisingh, provided he agreed to pay in future .....a fixed rent of Rs. 44,000 per annum... .It appears, from what has already been stated, that the Khetri Chieftain is in the double relation of a Tributary and a Farmer to the Raja of Jaipur. For his share of the lands of Jhunjhunu and Narhar, seized on originally by his ancestor Sardulsingh, he pays a fixed sum of money annually in the shape of tribute as a seditres, or acknowledgement, to the Jaipur Government. For than Abhye Singh's letter, so he could not refer to it in that letter.

Col: Lockett writes "for the district of Babai which he holds in farm as an istimrari grant" . "revocable at will" This shows that he did not know the meaning of the words used in the grant. There is no mention of an ijara and the word instimrari means permanent. His further remarks that the resumption would be harsh are based on the mis conception that an instimrari grant is revocable, which, of course, it is not. Towards the end of the paragraph it is suggested that either it was suppressed or Col: Lockett misinterpreted it. This much is certain that no Khetri man told Col: Lockett that Rajah Abhye Singh held it in farm as an istimrari grant that was revocable at will. This information was apparently obtained from some Jaipur man who completely misinformed him Whether the grant was before him or not, it is not possible to say now, nor is it understandable why Rajah Abhye Singh should have withheld it, because if he was setting up the grants from the Emperor, Col: Lockett would have said so. The grant of 1814 had been rejected by General Ochterlony if, indeed, he had ever considered it and the lease of 1818 was not "istimrari". Therefore the only paper he could rely on was this parawanah of 1822. Equally, the Jaipur State

the district of Babai, which he holds in farm as an istimrari grant, he pays a quit-rent which has varied from Rs 4,500 to Rs. 44,000 per annum. The former possessions are hereditary, the latter are revocable at will: though it must be acknowledged that the resumption of Babai, under all the circumstances of the case as already detailed, would be a harsh, if not an unjust, measure." Colonel Lockett thus reaches the remarkable conclusion that "At all events, the resumption of the district, *during the Raja's minority* and by a Minister so little respected as Jhutharam, could never be viewed in a favourable light by any of the respectable Chieftains and Thakurs of Shekhawati."

would not set up the title of Abhye Singh on the 1814 grant, for that put the mamla at Rs. 4,500 and the later document of 1822, the Khas Mohur Parwanah, is a permanent grant of Babai on a yearly payment of Rs. 44,000. It is the only paper that combines the characteristics which have been consistently observed since 1821 of a permanent tenure on a fixed mamla.

This paper has been preserved, ever since it was issued, by the Khetri Rajahs and its copy by the Jaipur States Officials. How is this the case if it has no validity? If it was obtained improperly, why has no Jaipur Maharajah or Jaipur minority administration ever questioned the right of the Khetri Rajah to hold the property? More particularly in the earlier years 1822-1845, when many people were alive who knew all the facts? How is it that no Political Officer has ever suggested that the Khetri Rajah had no title to Babai? Why is it entered in the State Papers as ijara istimrar, if that was not the way that the State construed the documents of 1822?

The words of the Khas Mohur Parwana of 1822 practically reiterate the words of Rajah Abhye Singh's complaint about the excessive rise in the Mamla which he uses in his letter to Captain Stewart. The summary rejection of his objection in the parwana seem

to show that some order had been received from the British Officer that the only consideration he could get was a recognition of his rights to the pergunnah on the higher mamla, as to which there was to be no reduction. It is probable that he received this consideration in view of the assistance which he had given the British Government at the time the treaty was negotiated and the old friendly relations between the Rajah and the British, instanced by the exchange of Paggris referred to by Col: Gardener in 1803 and from the fact that he undoubtedly had proved a genuine right to the permanent grant of 1814, but had been arbitrarily compelled to pay an enhanced mamla for it for the 3 years 1818—1821. It is further necessary to point out that if the parwana had not received the the concurrence of tne British Resident. it could only have been objected to by him on the ground of its reducing the Revenue and so the chances of the British Government getting its tribute from the State Revenues. Such objection could not affect its validity *qua* the Jaipur State. As it did not reduce the Revenue, it could not have been objected to by the British Authorities.

A similar Khas Mohur Parwana is accepted as a valid document in the Report, though it is issued by the

128 This quotation from the Journal of 1831 illustrates the break in the sequence of the British official records between 1818-19 and 1831 A D It is evident that Colonel Lockett wrote with out reference to the records of 1818-19 He learnt of Ochterlony's intervention, apparently, from Raja Abhaisingh; and can hardly have been aware either of that officer's proceedings for the restoration of Babai to the State khalsa, which resulted in the issue of a simple lease for three years only, or of the Governor-General's orders which rendered null and void any grant of importance made during the Minority without the previous sanction of the Government of India A curious circumstance is the insistence by Colonel Lockett in 1831 that the Khetri Raja held Babai in "farm as an istimrari grant" The Khas Mohar Parwana of 1822, negotiated through the slave-girl Rupa, is neither an Ijara nor an Ijara istimrar. It is a permanent grant, authorizing Raja Abhaisingh to include Babai in his hereditary Estate Either the Raja suppressed this document in 1831, because *he knew that it was null and void*, or else Colonel Lockett completely misinterpreted it. In any case, it is this invalid grant of 1822 that is now put forward as the basis Khetri's title.

Regent Rani in 1827, that, is during the minority. (See paragraph 138).

128. It is suggested that there was some break in the sequence of the British Records between 1818, 1819 and 1831. There is no ground for this whatever. The records are continuous as the Imperial Records in Calcutta show. See also Brookes *Political History* for some evidence of this. Col: Lockett was accompanied by Jhota Ram, who was determined to seize on the Khetri possessions on some pretext or another (Lockett p. 76). Did he not tell Col: Lockett?

The Khas Mohur Parwana was of 1822. The much stressed agreement of June 1818 would not affect it. Nor would the Agreement of 1819 mentioned in paragraph 125, as there was no appropriation by the Khetri Rajah, but a grant by the Regent Rani under the Maharajah's seal.

That Col: Lockett in 1831 wrote that the Khetri Rajah held Babai in farm as an istimrari grant . is called a curious circumstance in the Report. It is not a little difficult to understand this comment.

The Khas Mohur Parwana is a permanent grant including rights of all *kinds in, to, or arising out of the Taluqa* Babai for an annual payment of Rupees

44,000/- according to the report. Accepting the word ijara to mean a lease, Col. Lockett calls it a grant of a permanent lease. It would take a lawyer of exceptional experience and acumen to *distinguish the two descriptions* of the document.

129. It may be urged on Khetri's behalf that the Khas Mohar Parwana of 1822, however defective, was, nevertheless, obtained more than a hundred years ago; that the family has enjoyed uninterrupted possession ever since 1812; and that its right to the taluq is now being seriously questioned for the first time since 1818. Due consideration will be paid to these palliating circumstances in the solution of the case I have to offer There are, however, two important points which need emphasis. The lapse of 111 years, since the Khas Mohar Parwana was obtained, provides no cure for a defective title The law of Limitation in Jaipur has been deliberately framed so as to preclude limitation from running against the State No length of possession can create a legal title adverse to the Maharaja. Nor can it be argued that his Government has at any time admitted the validity of the Khetri Raja's title in Babai, so far as that title is based upon the Khas Mohar Parwana of 1822 Though the circumstances of the case have not hitherto been fully known, nevertheless the State has always maintained that the Raja of Khetri's tenure in Babai taluq is inferior to his tenure in the rest of the Thikana. Thus the State Council protested in 1891 against the recognition of the Raja of Khetri's mineral rights in

129. The title is said to be defective even if acquiesced in for the last 111 *years and reference is made to the* proceedings in 1891 in respect of the Khetri Rajah's mining rights in Babai. This is a very apposite reference. On the 6th March 1891 the Resident Jaipur by his letter No. 561 inquired from the Jaipur Council what rights were enjoyed by the Khetri Rajah in respect of the Babai mines.

This at one necessitated an inquiry into the Khetri title to Babai. There was only one possible answer if the Khas Mohur Parwana was not the shown to the Council by the Jaipur State Official who kept the State Records. That was "The Khetri Rajah has no title. He is holding ever since 1821 and can be ejected in any year." But the report of Anandi Lal of Kutchery Diwani, after inquiry from the officials concerned, has the following passage "Again in 1875 (1818 A.D.) *the ijara of the pargana* was renewed in favour of Rajah Abhye Singh and according to agreement the ijara was fixed at Rs. 40,000 for Sambat

Babai on the ground of the weakness of his territorial tenure. The State has at no time acquiesced in Khetri's pretension to hold Babai by virtue of the Khas Mohar Parwana of 1822.

1875 (1818 A.D.), Rupees 42,000 for Sambat 1876 and Rupees 44,000 for Sambat 1877 (1821 A.D.).

Since that time the pargannah continues to remain in the ijara istimrar of Khetri on payment of Rs. 44,000 annually in the Raj Treasury."

"These papers shall prove fully to the Rajaji of Khetri that this Taluqa was given on ijara to him by the Durbar and there cannot be accepted any argument of its not being in Istimrar tenure."

Then the paper goes on to show that the Durbar agrees that the Khetri Rajah has all rights of Babai mines. This was approved by all the members of the Council on 16-12-1891.

The Resident thereon writes to Rajah Ajit Singh on 28-12-1891 (Babai Appendix 17). The following passage occurs in this letter:—

"As you have no documentary proof in support of your idea that the Taluqa is not (?) an actual grant and as that idea is not consistent with the fact of your paying the Darbar of a fixed annual sum for the Taluqa which sum is not called Mamla in the Darbar documents and is therefore evidently a quit rent (istimrar payment) on a perpetual lease, I think you should rest content with the recognition of your mining rights......"

The State has never previously disclosed the Khas Mohur Parwana, but what paper did the Council see on which they all approved of the Statement, above noted, *viz.*, — "Since that time" (1821) "the pergannah" continues to remain in the ijara istimrar of Khetri on payment of Rupees 44,000 annually in the Raj Treasury. *These papers* shall prove to the Rajahji of Khetri ;that this Taluqa was given on a ijara to him by the Durbar and there cannot be accepted any argument of its not being in *istimrar tenure*."

This curiously enough is the same phrase that Colonel Lockett uses of the tenure enjoyed by the Khetri Rajah in Babai to which attention is drawn in this paragraph. It seems that a Jaipur Official was his informant. This goes to show very forcibly that the parwana was held to be an istimrar ijara in 1831. and 1891. Is it open to the Jaipur State to now go back on this? If so, can the Khetri Rajah also go back to the ijara istimrar of 1814, which is undoubtedly genuine, duly executed, and for good considerotion? He could forego any refund of the excess payment levied from him under the pressure of General Ochterlony for the years 1818 — 1821 and claim that the annual payment should be Rs. 4,500, even if no deductions were given. Or, he can set up his title under the Moghul and Mahratta Sanads, as Rajah Ajit Singh

seems to have done in 1891 instead of relying on his title under the Jaipur State Sanads. The disturbance of "long-established usage" would have far reaching effects if limitation is wiped out and the title is to be gone into afresh. The party in possession would not be debarred from setting up his titles by any law of Limitation.

That the State should have always maintained, "that the Rajah of Khetri's tenure in Babai taluqa is inferior to his tenure in the rest of the Thikana" is in full accord with this reply of the Panchpana Thikanedars. Babai Taluqa, if considered a permanent grant from Jaipur on annual payment, which the State does not call Mamla, is a holding from Jaipur; while the rest of the Thikana is not held on any grant from Jaipur and the payment for it is accordingly distinguished as Mamla. The rest, is, as already shown, Independent Territory subject to a tribute payable to the Jaipur State under long established usage.

It may be useful to set out briefly the past story of the Khetri Rajahs' title to Babai and their connection with the British Government.

They orignate form Sardul Singh of Udaipurwati, whose Chiefs were certainly not subject to Jaipur at its origin. They were in exactly the same class as,

but on a smaller scale than, the Amber Independent Watandars Nor did Jai Singh take ijaras for its tribute before 1730. In his position as a land owner of Udaipurwati Sardul-Singh was entirely independent of Jaipur and had as Diwan in Jhunjhunu far too good a position to lose in return for becoming only a sub-lessee of Maharajah Jai Singh in 1732 As the new Chief in 1732, Sardul Singh agreed to pay Rs. 7,00,000/- for Jhunjhunu—there was an extra 5,000 - for certain additional properties. Maharajah Jai Singh had only realised 30,000/- from the Qaimkhani Nawab Fazil Khan of Jhunjhunu in 1726. (See P. S. 4 and Qabuliat of Fazil Khan for 1726 P. S. 9). The change of Chieftain in 1732 from the Qaimkhani to the Shekhawat, Sardul Singh, led to a rise of Rs. 40,000/- in the profits of Maharajah Jai Singh.

In 1781 A.D. theKhetri Rajah receives the Sanad of Babai as a permanent grant from the Moghul Emperor Shah Alam. II

In 1790 he obtains a similar Sanad including 3 other paragannahs from the Mahratta.

In 1803 the Khetri Rajah is on terms of extreme intimacy with Colonel Gardener and flies the British flag over his fort of Khetri in the year. (See Petition of Col: Gardener to Lord Lake).

seems to have done in 1891 instead of relying on his title under the Jaipur State Sanads. The disturbance of "long-established usage" would have far reaching effects if limitation is wiped out and the title is to be *gone into afresh*. The party in possession would not be debarred from setting up his titles by any law of Limitation.

That the State should have always maintained, "that the Rajah of Khetri's *tenure in Babai taluqa is inferior to* his tenure in the rest of the Thikana" is in full accord with this reply of the Panchpana Thikanedars. Babai Taluqa, if considered a permanent grant from Jaipur on annual payment, which the State does not call Mamla. is a holding from Jaipur; while the rest of the Thikana is not held on any grant from Jaipur and the payment for it is accordingly distinguished as Mamla. The rest, is, as already shown, Independent Territory subject to a tribute payable to the Jaipur State under long established usage.

It may be useful to set out briefly the past story of the Khetri Rajahs' title to Babai and their connection with the British Government.

They originate form Sardul Singh of Udaipurwati, whose Chiefs were certainly not subject to Jaipur at its origin. They were in exactly the same class as

but on a smaller scale than, the Amber Independent Watandars Nor did Jai Singh take ijaras for its tribute before 1730. In his position as a land owner of Udaipurwati Sardul-Singh was entirely independent of Jaipur and had as Diwan in Jhunjhunu far too good a position to lose in return for becoming only a sub-lessee of Maharajah Jai Singh in 1732. As the new Chief in 1732, Sardul Singh agreed to pay Rs. 7,00,000/- for Jhunjhunu--there was an extra 5,000/- for certain additional properties Maharajah Jai Singh had only realised 30,000/- from the Qaimkhani Nawab Fazil Khan of Jhunjhunu in 1726 (See P. S. 4 and Qabuliat of Fazil Khan for 1726 P. S. 9). The change of Chieftain in 1732 from the Qaimkhani to the Shekhawat, Sardul Singh, led to a rise of Rs. 40,000/- in the profits of Maharajah Jai Singh.

In 1781 A.D. theKhetri Rajah receives the Sanad of Babai as a permanent grant from the Moghul Emperor Shah Alam. II

In 1790 he obtains a similar Sanad including 3 other paragannahs from the Mahratta.

In 1803 the Khetri Rajah is on terms of extreme intimacy with Colonel Gardener and flies the British flag over his fort of Khetri in the year. (See Petition of Col: Gardener to Lord Lake).

In 1806. The Khetri Rajah is given the Pargannah of Kotputli by the British Government through Lord Lake. (See Aitchison Vol: III, p. 117).

In July 1812. Rajah Abhye Singh received a Kharita from Sir C. T. Metcalfe conveying the acknowledgments of the British Government for the Khetri Rajah's co-operation along with his forces. He receives a similar acknowledgment in 1817.

In 1814. Sir C. T. Metcalfe congratulates him on receiving the grant of Babai from the Jaipur Maharajah.

In 1816. Rajah Abhye Singh entered into a conditional agreement with the British Government through Sir C. T. Metcalfe (See Report paragraph 42) at some risk to his future relations with his overlord, the Maharajah of Jaipur.

On 21st January, 1818, he received a Tussulli Namah from Sir C. T. Metcalfe promising him the future protection of the British Government.

On 21st June, 1818. General Ochterlony and Mohun Ram Nazir compel Abhye Singh's son, Bakhtawar Singh, to sign a 3 year lease for Babai on an excessive payment rising from 4,500 to 44,000/- in 1821.

In January 1822, in spite of the bitter hatred of Jhuta Ram, Rajah

Abhye Singh, having set out his position in his letter of 22nd January, 1822 to the Political Resident, secures the Khas Mohur Parwana grant of 26th January, 1822; a copy of which is sent to the Jaipur Records Office at the time

In 1831 Col: Lockett states that the Khetri Rajah holds Babai on an istimrari grant.

In 1891. The question of the Khetri Rajah's rights comes up and it is decided by the Council that he has the incontrovertible right of an istimrari ijara in Babai Taluqa.

The position is thus shown as fixed by long-established usage that the Khetri Rajah has a very old title which has been at various dates confirmed and in 1822 the payment thereon was enhanced, and it has since then never been questioned.

130. In view of Khetri's prolonged possession of Babai I would not, on the ground of defective title, suggest that the Raja should be dispossessed; but it is certain that, had the facts now known been known in 1891, the mineral rights in that tract would never have been admitted in favour of the Thikanedar. As a compromise, the Raja of khetri might be invited to surrender his mineral rights in both Khetri and Babai, in exchange for a document giving him a permanent title in the latter area. This would not be driving a hard bargain. The copper mines of Khetri

130. It is proposed that the Jaipur State should go back on its records and its Council ruling in 1891 and bestow lesser rights by a new paper title The report repudiates its own suggestion that it might be called a hard bargain.

and Babai have not been worked since 1872; and the Raja would be asked to surrender merely a potential source of income It is inconsistent with the sovereign rights of the Maharaja (see para. 192 below) That a subordinate Estate holder should enjoy the commercial-profits from an important mineral source on the strength of what was, originally, little more than an Ijara for, the minting of copper coin

131 One difficulty still remains The Raja of Khetri is a minor; and H. H the Maharaja, as his Guardian under the Court of Wards, is in a position of trust, and cannot very well enter into any compromise or settlement with his subordinate officers such as would be binding on the Raja of Khetri on his attaining his majority. If, therefore, a compromise is desired, whereby the Khetri Raja surrenders his undoubted mining rights in Khetri and the concession he obtained in 1891 in respect of minerals in Babai in exchange for a permanent title in the latter taluq, it would seem necessary to postpone the final settlement of the case for another five years.

[NOTE—The Persian copy of the *Settlement of the 21st June, 1818 A. D. shows* that that date coincided with Asarh Sudi 3, Sambat 1874 The three-years lease of Babai, mentioned in para: 121 above (P. S 396), is dated Asarh Sudi 12, Sambat 1874, which, trerefore, coincided with the 30th of June, 1818 A. D. I may note here that these dates in the Vikrami era are given according to the "Raj" Sambat, in official use in Jaipur, which commences in *Bhadon* (Aug:-Sept:) not in *Chait* (March-April). For dates in the "Raj" Sambat it would, more often than not, be correct to deduct

131. The State papers call the holding of the Babai Taluq a permanent lease on payment of Rupees 44,000/- annually.

The State Council in 1891 insisted that this was incontrovertibly the nature of the title.

The Khas Mohur Parwana calls it a permanent grant on the same terms.

It is therefore very difficult to discover in the proposal here made what the Khetri Rajah is supposed to receive in return for his mining rights. The consideration seems illusory, unless it is to be free of all future payment.

The remarks made herein are submitted as an addition to the reply made in March 1934. As far as possible they refrain from reiterating the Statements already contained, but it has been found necessary to deal with many of the points already set up in the earlier reply.

56, as Tod always did (I. 101), in calculating the corresponding date A D But elsewhere in this report I have followed the normal practice of deducting 57 for such conversions, as I am not always sure whether the date in Hindi is given in the official (Raj) Sambat or in the popular (Raiyat) Sambat)

PART IX—THE MEANING OF MAMLA AND CHAKOTI

161. Much importance is attached by the Thikanedars to the local terms used for the revenue payable by them. In Sikar, Panchpana-Singhana (including Khetri), Udaipurwati and Uniara the Thikanedars are "Mamlaguzars". The revenue they pay is called Mamla (or, more correctly, Mu'amala), Mamlat or Mamlati. The Thikanedars contend that these terms signify Tribute, payable by one State in subordinate relations with another—just as the Jaipur State paid Mamla to the Marathas—a view which, it may be remembered, was put forward by one of the early Agents to the Governor-General (see paragraph 56 above). The word, however, has a variety of uses and was also applied by the Marathas to ordinary land-revenue assessments (cf. the "Mamlatdar" in the Bombay Presidency at the present day); and I am credibly informed that, throughout the Punjab, the word is still so used No particular significance was, at first, attached to it in the Jaipur State Latterly it has acquired a special local meaning from its application to the payments of a special local class. In other words, Mamla, in itself, does not in any way indicate that the revenue-payer enjoys a special or

PART IX.—MAMLA.

161—162. The Jaipur State has from of old distinguished between the tributaries who pay Mamla and its ijaredars. The payments made by the latter is naver called Mamla. This term is only applied to the payments made by Shikar, Khetri, Panchpana, Uniara and the Udaipurwati Bhomias. In Baden Powells Land System of British India Vol: III, page 325, Mamla is stated to have been used by the Mahrattas for the tribute it levied from the Rajputana States. That is, *it is a term used for tribute and not* for ordinary land revenue. The word therefore does indicate a special payment of tribute to Jaipur State.

privileged status; but the fact that privileged revenue-payers in the Jaipur State have appropriated this particular term has given it a particular local connotation

162 The word Mamla primarily means an arrangement or settlement—usually a business settlement—between parties It seems to have been introduced locally, as a revenue term, after the Marathas applied it to their levies from Rajputana, and is not found in the old State papers prior to 1750 A D. A good instance of the original use of the term appears in the Patan papers (P 56) The "asli" or basic assessment of Patan is there shown as Rs 20,000, to which Rs 2 500 is *added* for expenses and Rs 2,753 for arrears, making a total Mamla of Rs. 25,253 That the word Mamla had originally no special or technical significance is also indicated by its use at one time as interchangeable with the word Ijara Thus, in a set of six precisely similar documents dated Phagun Badi ek, St. 1840 (1783 A.D), three orders are addressed to certain Panchpana Sardars and three counterfoils to the Mutsaddi (State's Agent) for Shekhawati. In each case, in addressing the Sardars the word Ijara is used; whereas in each case, in addressing the Mutsaddi, the term Mamlat is preferred (P.S. 321).

163. The term Chakoti is more rarely used. It appears in a Patan document of 1735 (P. 5); in a Sikar document of 1766 (S 165); and again in a Patan document of 1818 (P. 66). In the last-mentioned case the word clearly has its inherent meaning of a payment in settlement of an account. It is there stated that the

163. If Mamla means, as set out in this paragraph, the actual or net amount payable after a settlement of account, it would not be open to revision now. This has also been the view held about the Mamla by both Jaipur State and the Thikanedars for over 120 years.

Rao of Patan's assessment has been fixed at Rs. 12,000, from which Rs 1,500 is to be deducted on account of Jagir, leaving Rs 10,500 as Chakoti. The term Chakoti or Chukoti is obviously connected with the verb "Chukana" meaning "to pay off" or "to settle with", and thus has precisely the same significance as Mamla, I would, therefore, define both Chakoti and Mamla as meaning simply "the actual or net amount payable after a settlement of account".

164 The use of Mamla with reference to the payments made by Uniara confirms the above conclusion. In that Thikana we first find a payment of Rs 15,000 made on account of "the Faujdari and Subedari of Subah Ajmer" (Un. 63); and later Rs. 3,000 is allotted to Subah and *Rs 26,750 to Faujdari (Un. 78); but,* eventually, the whole amount is classed under Subah In 1801-2 we find the phrase "Subah ki mamlati" applied to a sum of Rs. 1,13,734/9/- which includes Rs. 11,178/13/- for 1798 and Rs. 1,02,555/12/- for three years 1799 to 1801, at Rs 34,185/4/- per annum (Un. 276 and 279). Here again "Subah ki mamlati" clearly means "the actual or net amount payable after a settlement of account."

165. The Khandela Thikana is not allowed by the State to call its revenue payment Mamla (see para: 140 above). The State is aware of the special significance which the Thikanedars attach to the term, and, for this reason only, attempts to restrict its use to as few of them as possible. It is well known that Khandela was in 1836 restored to its old holders under an Ijara istimrar, whereas

164. The Mamla of Uniara was payable as faujdari Ranthambore which was included in Subah Ajmere. The entries about this Mamla vary in different years as shown in paragraph 153, but its character of Mamla never changes It is always *the tribute payable.*

165. This section is a curiously naive admission of the difference between a payment from an istimrar ijaredar and these independent tributaries. The State will not permit the former to class its payment as Mamla. That is because it clearly is not Mamla. The significance of this obvious distinction is entirely missed by the Report. The Khandela

privileged status; but the fact that privileged revenue-payers in the Jaipur State have appropriated this particular term has given it a particular local connotation

162. The word Mamla primarily *means* an arrangement or settlement—usually a business settlement—between parties It seems to have been introduced locally, as a revenue term, after the Marathas applied it to their levies from Rajputana, and is not found in the old State papers prior to 1750 A D A good instance of the original use of the term appears in the Patan papers (P 56) The "asli" or basic assessment of Patan is there shown as Rs 20,000, to which Rs 2 500 is *added* for expenses and Rs 2,753 for arrears, *making a total Mamla of Rs 25,253* That the word Mamla had originally no special or technical significance is also indicated by its use at one time as interchangeable with the word Ijara. Thus, in a set of six precisely similar documents dated Phagun Badi ek, St. 1840 (1783 A.D), three orders are addressed to certain Panchpana Sardars and three counterfoils to the Mutsaddi (State's Agent) for Shekhawati. In each case, in addressing the Sardars the word Ijara is used; whereas in each case, in addressing the Mutsaddi, the term Mamlat is preferred (P.S. 324).

163. The term Chakoti *is more rarely* used. It appears in a Patan document of 1735 (P. 5); *in a Sikar document of* 1766 (S. 165); and again in a Patan document of 1818 (P 66). *In the last-mentioned* case the word clearly has its inherent *meaning of a payment in settlement of* an account. It is there stated that the

163. *If Mamla means, as set o* in this paragraph, the actual or n amount payable after a settlement account, it would not be open to revisio now. This has also been the view hel about the Mamla by both Jaipur Stat and the Thikanedars for over 120 years.

Rao of Patan's assessment has been fixed at Rs. 12,000, from which Rs 1,500 is to be deducted on account of Jagir, leaving Rs. 10,500 as Chakoti. The term Chakoti or Chukoti is obviously connected with the verb "Chukana" meaning "to pay off" or "to settle with", and thus has precisely the same significance as Mamla. I would, therefore, define both Chakoti and Mamla as meaning simply "the actual or net amount payable after a settlement of account".

164. The use of Mamla with reference to the payments made by Uniara confirms the above conclusion. In that Thikana we first find a payment of Rs 15,000 made on account of "the Faujdari and Subedari of Subah Ajmer" (Un. 63); and later Rs. 3,000 is allotted to Subah and Rs. 26,750 to Faujdari (Un. 78); but, eventually, the whole amount is classed under Subah. In 1801-2 we find the phrase "Subah ki mamlati" applied to a sum of Rs. 1,13,734/9/- which includes Rs. 11,178/13/- for 1798 and Rs 1,02,555/12/- for three years 1799 to 1801, at Rs. 34,185/4/- per annum (Un. 276 and 279). Here again "Subah ki mamlati' clearly means "the actual or net amount payable after a settlement of account."

164. The Mamla of Uniara was payable as faujdari Ranthambore which was included in Subah Ajmere. The entries about *this Mamla vary in different* years as shown in paragraph 153, but its character of Mamla never changes. It is always the tribute payable.

165. The Khandela Thikana is not allowed by the State to call its revenue payment Mamla (see para: 140 above) The State is aware of the special significance which the Thikanedars attach to the term, and, for this reason only, attempts to restrict its use to as few of them as possible. It is well known that Khandela was in 1836 restored to its old holders under an Ijara istimrar, whereas

165. This section is a curiously naive admission of the difference between a payment from an istimrar ijaredar and these independent tributaries. The State will not permit the former to class its payment as Mamla. That is because it clearly is not Mamla. The significance of this obvious distinction is entirely missed by the Report. The Khandela

it has not hitherto been realized that this is also the basis of the tenure of other Mamlaguzars (*e g* Sikar). The State has, therefore, maintained that payment under an Ijara istimrar is not the same as Mamla. There is, however, no peculiarity in the tenure of Khandela. The present Khandela payment of Rs. 63,501/12/- is "the net amount payable after a settlement of account" and is, therefore, as much a Mamla payment as that of any other Thikana. In the case of the Shyamgarh Thikana and of the taluq of Awan the State has failed to retain the recollection of their separate origin under an Ijara istimrar; and so in these cases, no objection has been raised to the inclusion of their assessment in the general Mamla for Sikar and Uniara, respectively.

166. The further question arises whether the terms Mamla and Chakoti in themselves indicate a fixed and permanent settlement in respect of the net assessment. The early Political Officers regarded the payments of the Thikanedars as the tribute of subordinate States They considered it to be fixed; but it is nowhere stated whether the gross or the net assessment was considered to be fixed. In any case they seem to have been opposed to any alteration of the assessment; and, therefore, none took place, except in respect of the Bhumias of Udaipurwati. The net assessments have in the course of a century acquired what I would call a conventional stability; but it would be unfair to the State to penalize it because in the past the

payment may be "the net amount payable after a settlement of account", but it is not a payment of Mamla. That is the significant difference, and is owing to the fact that the Khandela Thikanedars are no longer independent Tributaries. The small Shyamgarh estate of $11\frac{1}{2}$ villages is admittedly held in ijara istimrar by the Sikar Rao Rajah, and, similarly, the Awan taluq of 15 villages by the Rao Rajah of Uniara, but as these two Rao Rajahs each pay a large sum in Mamla the smaller item has been merged in the greater and the entire amount called Mamla. This is intelligible but does not destroy the distinction normally observed between Mamla and ijara payments.

166. The report refers to some proceedings of 1814, but it is impossible to say what is meant. What Sir David Ochterlony did in 1818 or in the subsequent years up to 1825 has already been dealt with in detail.

It has been shown that the British Official view was not mistaken but based on the actual facts as disclosed by a proper consideration of all the materials now available. That being so, there is no ground for reopening the longestablished usage.

position of its Thikanedars has been misunderstood There is no valid authority whatever for the contention of certain of the Thikanedars that their Mamla payments have been recognized by the State as permanently fixed. Attempts were made by Sikar and Khetri in 1814 to secure such a concession; but this was merely a part of their *modus operandi* during the Time of Trouble, which was exposed by Sir David Ochterlony. Sikar's basic assessment was permanently fixed by the Darbar, and we can hardly differentiate Khetri in this respect; but their net assessments have no more than a conventional stability behind them—a stability due not to any action or agreement of the State but to the weight of British official opinion based upon a mistaken estimate of the origin and status of these Thikanedars. In the circumstances, a compromise is necessary; and I have, in dealing with individual cases, recommended that the stability of the net assessment should be respected, except where some particular deduction which the Thikanedar still enjoys is now plainly without justification (see paragraph 60 above).

167. My conclusion in this matter is a simple one. The tenure of each of the Thikanedars of Sikar, Panchpana-Singhana (including Khetri), Khandela, Patan and Uniara is practically uniform throughout his Thikana The tenure of each is also, for all practical purposes, the same as the tenure of the others It is, in effect, a lease in perpetuity, held on a permanently fixed basic assessment from which certain deductions are made which have

167. The incorrectness of the view that the Thikanedars only had a position of subijaredars of Jaipur State has been very exhaustively dealt with in this reply. It has been shown that they all held the Status of Proprietary Chieftains in their localities. That they had to pay a tribute. That Jaipur State took a farm of the Jagirs payable out of

themselves become conventionally stabilized All these Thikanedars may, therefore, be included in a single category as Istimrardars. This is the term which should be employed to denote their land-tenure. Their assessment may be called Mamla as heretofore; but the term should not be accepted as signifying more than the net amount payable under a present or former settlement of account. It has no bearing at all on the question of their land-tenure. The use of the word Mamla to denote the revenue payments of the Bhumias of Udaipurwati confirms this conclusion The Bhumia tenure is quite distinct from the tenure of the other Thikanedars dealt with in this report, and yet their payments are likewise called Mamla

their tribute and sublet the right to collect it to the Chieftains who no doubt made a profit by excess collection while Jaipur made a profit by agreeing to pay the Jagirdar less than the amount recoverable as tribute.

The Chieftains, as the lords of the territory, were able to exact such payments more easily and profitably than any one else. Their Status as Independent Chieftains subject to the payment of tribute to the Emperor was in no way affected but such subleases. Their later payments of tribute to Jaipur were not as sublessees but as being included in the sum due to the new Power, the Mahratta. This was one reason. Another was the necessity to pay some power who could give them some measure of protection. Both motives operated; sometimes jointly. These Thikanedars were never istimrar ijaredars and feel no desire to be placed in that classification as the resultant disadvantages are manifest.

Section VI—The Special Powers of Thikanedars.

PART III—MINES AND QUARRIES

187. Evidence in support of customary claims to mineral rights in the Thikanas of the Jaipur State is necessarily uncertain, since such evidence arises only when a particular mineral has acquired a commercial value, either immediate or potential. For the Mogul period, the only notice of local minerals that I have been able to trace occurs in the Ain-i-Akbari (Ain II p 193) where the following entries appear:—

"*Babai*, has a stone fort and a copper mine"

"*Singhana*, Udaipur, has a copper mine and mint for copper coinage."

188 The Babai parganah was taken on Ijara by Sawai Jaisingh from Nawab Muzaffar Ali Khan in 1730 (P. S. 28 & 30), while Singhana was taken on Ijara from the Moguls by Maharaja Madhosingh in 1751 (P S 166). We are told that Singhana, prior to the grant of this Ijara, had been "badshahi khalsa". I presume, therefore, that the imperial rights in these mines passed, in the first instance, to the Maharajas of Jaipur It was formerly the custom to farm out the right of minting coin; and it was in the Jaipur State commonly farmed in conjunction with the Rahdari (Road Police Tax). Thus in 1818, in the Ijara given for the parganah of Sawai Madhopur, we find an item of Rs 45,000 for "Rahdari and Takshal"—Takshal meaning Mint from Taka, a copper coin. The connection between these two heads of revenue is

Section VI—The Special Powers of Thikanedars

PART III.—MINES AND QUARRIES.

187. This section commences with a reference to customary claims to mineral rights and quotes the Ain-i-Akbari for the fact that Babai had a Copper mine, Singhana, Udaipur had a Copper mine and mint for Copper Coinage. No evidence of any custom, however, is referred to. The paragraph does not therefore seem to need a reply.

188. It is stated that the Babai Jagir of Nawab Mozaffar Ali Khan was taken on farm by Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh. This, as has so often been already shown, was merely a farm of of the right to collect the tribute to the extent that it was allotted to the Jagirdar of whose Jagir the ijaredar held the farm (ijara). Areas were often liable for the Jagir (salary) of more than one person. The right under an ijara would give no right to the produce of a mine in any area. If the amount due under the Jagir was not paid in full by the Land Chieftain then all the income of whatever kind from his property would become liable for the balance due.

not apparent—nor have I found anyone capable of explaining it—but that it existed is confirmed by the Instructions issued with the Rahdari Qanun of 1870 (referred to in para: 206 below) which show that the old taxes on trade were levied sometimes at the Takshal office and sometimes at the Rahdari office.

The same reply covers the case of the ijara of Singhana held by Maharajah Madho Singh. It is absolutely impossible to raise any presumption that the Imperial rights in these mines passed in any sense to the Maharajahs of Jaipur. In the first place, there were no Imperial rights as far as the records show. When an area is Khalsa the tribute goes direct to the Imperial purse. When it ceases to be Khalsa the tribute becomes liable for payment of the salary (Jagir) of some Imperial official or officials. The mining rights remain with the landed Chieftains, who all along enjoyed them. The right to mint coin is quite separate from the right to the minerals in a mine. The fact that there was a fort and a copper mine in Babai shown in Ain-i-Akbari does not mean that the fort and mine belonged to the Emperor. Similarly, the entry about a copper mine and mint in Singhana Udaipur does not show whether the the copper was purchased for the mint or what was done about it. The right to mint may have been farmed or minting may have have been carried on by Moghul employees; but there is no evidence about it whatever. The farming of the right to mint coins and the customs rights are quite separate from the right to the minerals in a mine. Anybody might take a farm of the customs and minting rights, even if he

189. When the descendants of Sardulsingh of Jhunjhunu were given Singhana, the right to mint copper coin was included in their Ijara. This can be inferred from two documents of 1783 (P S 323-4), in which Baghsingh of Khetri and other Shekhawat Sardars were directed to pay certain State employees in Singhana monthly salaries of Rs 800 and Rs. 15 out of their receipts from Rahdari and Takshal. To recoup this disbursement, the Sardars were authorized to make an equivalent deduction from the sum payable by them to the State on account of their Ijara. It is certain, then, that the Khetri Thikanedars held the Ijara for the old mint at Singhana in 1783: and the mines have continued in their possession ever since. Colonel Brooke published in 1864 an article on the Mines of Khetri in Rajputana" (see Vol XXXIII of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal) He describes the mines as owned by the miners themselves or by traders who had bought them from the miners; but he also tells us that the Raja of Khetri took, as his share, about one-fourth of the copper produced. He further mentions, in connection with the mint for copper coin, that out of 1212 Takas or half-anna pieces, being the yield from a maund of copper, 269 Takas were the Khetri Raja's share. The mint was closed, with the approval of the Government of

had no copper mine. The Jaipur State gave a contract in 1818 for the Rahdari and taksal in Sawai Madhopur, but there is no mention of any copper mine in that area.

189. There is again necessity to explain the effect of an ijara—in this case a sub-ijara. The tribute payable by a Chieftain would be a liability against all his proprietary income of whatever kind. The farm or lease of this tribute would therefore carry the same right and the sublease would equally give the same right to the sublessee In the case of a Chieftain becoming the sublessee of the farmer, the effect of enumerating the mining and customs rights in his sublease would be to make it clear that the income from these rights also was liable for the realisation of the tribute. Another very important consequence of the enumeration of the customs and mining rights as being among the rights liable for the payment of the tribute is to prove conclusively that these were rights of the Chieftain and not of the Emperor. For if they belonged to the Emperor, the farmer could not touch them and therefore could not have given them in sublease to Sardul Singh's descendants.

The fact that P.S. 323, 324 say that they can pay the salaries of Rs. 800 and Rs. 15 out of the rahdari and

India, in 1869. The main use of the copper was, apparently, for minting coin, which I infer that the old Ijara for the Takshal signified a general Ijara for the Singhana copper mines.

Taksal would go to show that the payments were to be made at a season when income from the agricultural produce was not available; it was to be debited in the Mamla or tribute.

P.S. 323 & 324 amount to this: "Please pay our officials out of your rahdari and taksal income and when you collect the tribute from your tenants you can debit these payments against that tribute." It did not mean that the rahdari and taksal income was liable for the payment of these two officials.

The mere mention of these sources of income in P.S. 323, 324 would not necessarily amount to a sublease of these rights. These descendants had these rights in any case, whether mentioned in a sub-ijara or not. It is curious to call a point certain which is admittedly only a matter of inference. Even if the right to mint at Singhana was in possession of the Khetri Thikanedar in 1783, it could not be given in an ijara covering the tribute, unless he had personally secured the right to mint from the Emperor. In that event it is quite possible that in his sublease of the tribute he might include all his sources of income as liable for the payment of the tribute, but it was within his discretion to include or exclude it. In any case, it is a matter of inference that it was included, and, if included, it proves that it was not regarded as an Imperial right.

The argument runs thus :—

First there is an inference that there was an ijara of the minting right and then a second inference, that there was an ijara of the copper mine in Singhana In this way a case can always be created out of mere assumptions.

The paragraph shows that 3/4th of the copper belonged to the miners, who undoubtedly would not have minting rights. They would make copper vessels of it and sell them in the market. The mines existed and were *worked long* before minting rights were obtained by Khetri in 1783.

It is not possible to argue that the important mining rights were covered by such inference on inference when a perfectly reasonable construction is shown to exist without employing this method of inferences. If these inferences fail, then the theory of the right being conveyed by Jaipur State temporarily to a sublessee in 1783 must also fail.

190. Babai was forcibly occupied by Raja Abhaising of Khetri in 1812, "and then measures adopted with the Manager of the day to obtain a Sanad" (see para. 124 above). In certain documents of 1814, 1818 and 1822 there is specific reference to the fact that the grant to the Raja included (among other things) "Zakat Kanat" (P S. 396, 410, I & L) The exact meaning of these terms has been questioned; but in my opinion, they present no difficulty. Zakat is the

190. The mining rights arising under the documents of 1814, 1818 and 1822 in favour of the Khetri Rajah are here admitted and the fact that the document of 1822 is an out and out grant is also admitted in paragraph 128. It is there argued however that it was not effective. The answer to this argument will be found in the reply to paragraph 128.

ordinary word used in Shekhawati for Rahdari, Kanat is the vulgar form of the more grammatical Kanhai, meaning mines. The whole phrase "Zakat Kanat" was, I have no doubt, the local rendering of "Rahdari Takshal". I conclude, therefore, that possession of the mines of Babai was transferred to Khetri by the documents of 1814, 1818 and 1822

191. The validity of Khetri's mining rights in Babai was questioned in 1891. The State challenged the Khetri Raja's title to the mines on the ground that his title throughout the Babai taluq was not of the same character as his title in the rest of his Estate The Resident, on the other hand, was insistent in pressing Khetri's claim, and the Council gave way, observing "it is recorded. ... that the taluq of Babai was leased to Raja Abhaisingh including Zakat Kanat Though no precise meaning can be given to the term Kanat, yet the Council does not hesitate to accept it as signifying mineral resources" Their logic was weak, though their instinct was sound "Kanat" unquestionably meant mines; but the Thikana had no better title to the mines than it had to the taluq of Babai itself. This line of argument the Council was not sufficiently well informed to pursue. The point has been dealt with in Section V Part IV. Here I simply record the fact that Khetri's tenure in Singhana and Babai undoubtedly, at present, includes the right to any income from the copper mines in those areas. I may note in passing that, to judge from the Gazetteers (R.G. II 160 & I G I. XXII 435), the Khetri mines seem to have been closed since 1872.

191. It may be said that the Council was not well enough informed in 1891 to pursue this line of argument that the Thikana had no better title to the mines than it had to the taluq of Babai itself. But the Parwana-nawis in 1891 must have been called on to produce the documents under which the Khetri Thikana held Babai, and if he could produce it in 1932, he could produce it in 1891. It must have been clearly seen to convey a full title. It was therefore not referred to. The 1891 papers on this mining question show that Khetri Thikana took up the attitude that they had won Babai at a period long before the British rule and hence they could not produce the Khas Mohur Parwana. In the result the Thikana was stated to hold on an istimrar tenure, which was the least that could be made of it.

92 It is urged on behalf of the
that the right to minerals is a
reign right. There is some force in
contention, although there are excep-
to the rule. The great Zamindars
Bengal, on the analogy, no doubt, of
great English landholders of the 18th
ury, obtained underground as well as
ce rights under the Permanent Settle-
of 1793, but normally in British
a mineral rights appertain to the
n. Similarly throughout Rajputana
right to the precious metals apper-
by custom to the Ruler of the State.
writes "Three things in Mewar are
lities a subject cannot meddle with:
"An" or oath of allegiance; 2.
n" or transit dues on commerce; 3
an" or mines of the precious metals"
d I p. 200 f. n 2). This evidence is
of course, conclusive for Jaipur; but
aises a presumption in favour of the
bar, so far as what are called "major"
erals are concerned. The State's title
ts territories (outside the Watan of
er) was originally derived from
as taken directly from the Moguls—
present Thikanedars in every case
ding from the State on a subordinate
re—and this lays upon each Thikane-
the onus of establishing any claim
mining rights adverse to the Maharaja.
for as "major" minerals are concern-
no question, to my knowledge, has
n raised anywhere in the State except
Khetri and Patan; and, in respect of
latter Thikana, a definite Resolution
been passed by the State Council
rming the State's right to all "major"
erals (see Resolution No 20, dated
16th of July, 1931). I conclude,

192. This paragraph sets up the argument that mining rights are sovereign rights. Reference is made to the right of the Government in British India. The position is obviously not analogous and no attempt is made to say that it is. The reference throws no light on the position in these Thikanas in Jaipur. The next reference is to Mewar and Tod Vol: I p. 200 foot-note 2 is quoted. The weakness of this analogy is felt, though it is dragged in. In Mewar all estates are held in Service Tenure (Jagir) and there are no tributes. Even in Mewar of the 3 royalties with which a subject cannot meddle according to Tod, the Second, Transit duties, are enjoyed by the Kachowla Jagirdar (See Administrative Report of Rajputana States 1869--70 p. 141). Then comes the oft stated theory that the State has title to its territories by means of ijaras and the present Thikanedars in every case holding from the States on a subordinate tenure, this being the method of excluding altogether from notice Chiefs areas and their payment of tribute as the liability enforced from them by the Mogluls by way of Revenue. All this is fully set out in Moreland's Agrarian System of Moslem India and quoted at length in this Reply in earlier paragraphs.

It also ignores the fact that such Chiefs were nearly always employed by

·refore, that mining rights for "major" nerals vest in the Darbar in all the ıkanas (except Khetri) with which I ı at present concerned. This is in cord with the general principle enunıted at the end of the State Council's solution No. 16, dated the 22nd of ly, 1930.

Maharajah Jai Singh II as his agents to collect the tribute due from their States because they held the strong position of Chiefs in their own areas — a position which the Report came perilously near to disclosing in paragraph 77.

It also ignores the fact that they have all along been recognized as holding such Status by all the British Officials who came in contact with them since the time of Sir Charles Metcalfe in 1817.

It also ignores all the records of historians including Tod, Elphinstone, Prinsep, Hamilton and others who made independent records beginning from 1808.

In the face of all these materials to say that the onus lies on the Thikanedars is difficult to understand. Even the State records on which the theory of mere sublessees is based do not for a moment suggest that the Thikanedars had not the Status of land Chieftains. It is shown, on the other hand, that it was precisely because they had this other Status that they were given the subleases.

This being the case and since the right of the Jaipur State is said to arise solely on the theory of the Thikanedars having nothing but a sublessee Status, then, when this is shown to be incorrect, there is no ground for calling on the Thikanedars to prove their right to mines.

193 In regard to less important, or what are called "minor" minerals, there is greater uncertainty. The principle here is the same; and the onus of establishing a claim adverse to the State doubtless rests upon the Thikanedar Such adverse claims are likely to be numerous, seeing that a large landholder of standing, having in the ordinary course made use for generations of the stone, slate, sand, etc: within his Estate, is in a position to put forward a prescriptive claim to their enjoyment It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the State has already formally recognized the quarrying rights for "minor" minerals (as distinct from the mining rights for "major" minerals) of several Thikanedars.

193. Does not require any further reply than that given above.

194 Khandela seems to be the only Estate within the purview of this report in respect of which a definite decision negativing its quarrying rights for "minor" minerals has been pronounced The first part of Resolution No 16, dated the 22nd of July 1931, runs as follows — "Resolved that, as both Panas of Thikana Khandela have failed to produce any *Sanad or Patta from the Darbar in* support of their claim to quarrying rights His Highness-in-Council considers that they have no such rights and cannot lease the quarries situated within their Thikanas or levy royalty, but they can take stone for their private construction only" On the other hand, the quarrying rights of the Patan Thikana have been admitted by Resolution No. 19, dated the 22nd of September, 1926, and, as mineral rights have been conceded to the Khetri Estate, it may certainly be presumed

194. Does not concern the Panchpana Singhana and Sikar Thikanas.

The admission of the rights of Khetri is noted.

that quarrying rights in that Thikana have also been transferred.

195 For Sikar, Umara, Udaipurwati and Panchpana-Singana (apart from Khetri) no decision of any kind has yet been reached. The actual position in these Thikanas can still be correctly summarized in the words used at a Political Officers's Conference in 1916: "It is believed that the more important and old established Thakurs in the Jaipur State do actually enjoy the entire profits from stone quarried within their Estates, but the Darbar claims the right in theory" These Thikanas, have, in fact, a claim by prescription which cannot be gainsaid It is, moreover, significant that, in the settlement with the Bhumias of Torawati, announced on the 18th of September, 1923, their quarrying rights were recognized in Istimrari villages The announcement in this connection runs as follows —"The Bhumia may take as much stone as he requires for his own purpose without charge If stone is required for any public work, Government may also take stone without charge The Bhumia shall have the right to lease the quarry, subject to the approval of the Jaipur Government; but must pay half the royalty to the Raj". Permission to take a royalty on "minor" minerals has also been conceded to the Thakurs of Ugriawas, Gigarh, Phalandi and Gangwar, and, when such rights are granted to Thakurs of lesser standing and even to Bhumia landholders, it would *be difficult to challenge the claim to a* similar concession on behalf of the Thikanas whose rights are being here discussed

195. The argument comes to this that when Bhumia landholders in Torawatti are granted certain subordinate rights the Thikanedars might well be given the same. As the position of the two are said to be poles apart, it is rather extraordinary to see such a suggestion put forward.

196. The natural course would seem to be to reserve to the State the right to extract, free of charge for a public purpose, any of the "minor" minerals included in the quarrying rights of these Thikanas The right of leasing the extraction of such "minor" minerals situated in the Thikana should rest with the Thikanedar, provided he limits the lease at each contract to a period which shall not, except with the previous approval of the State, exceed twelve months This proviso will be needed to enable the State to exercise, after due notice, the right reserved to it of utilizing the quarry, free of charge, for a public purpose The settlement with the Bhumias of Torawati has led to considerable friction, I understand; and I would not recommend the introduction elsewhere of the division of royalty which has been conceded in that case

196. The section is again a suggestion based on the sublessee Status and is of course inadmissible if that Status is not the real Status of the Thikanedars.

197. If the other conclusions reached in this report are endorsed, the Customs Cordon of the State will, in future, embrace all its Thikanas The export tax on "minor" minerals can then be regulated so as to yield to the State its share of the royalty on any particular local product, found in such quantity and quality as to command a market outside the State; while the royalty the Thikanas will be able to impose will, necessarily, be limited by the market-value within the State of such 'minor" minerals The solution suggested may be expected to work without much friction and will provide an acknowledgement of the superior rights of the Darbar, while recognizing

197. This is also based on the theory that the Thikanedars have no customs rights as being mere sublessees, which has been dealt with above. The customs rights are dealt with further on in the Report and Reply.

at the same time the undoubted prescriptive rights of the Thikanedar.

198. I would further suggest that the above solution be applied uniformly to all the six areas covered by this report. This will involve the revision of the orders, above quoted, which deny quarrying rights to Khandela. There should be the less objection to this modification seeing that the Government of India have already recognized, in some measure, the mineral rights of this Thikana, by paying the Rajas a substantial annual compensation since 1879 for the closure of the salt works which were formerly in existence within their limits. Moreover the argument in the Resolution, quoted in paragraph 194 above, that "both Panas of Thikana Khandela failed to produce any Sanad or Patta from the Darbar in support of their claim to quarrying rights", was an argument on paper only. No such Sanads or Pattas exist for any old Thikana. Least of all could they be expected from the Thikana which has by far the longest history behind it.

198. Calls for no reply.

199. In order to give effect to the suggestion contained in this note it will be necessary for the State to define "major" and "minor" minerals. These definitions should follow the existing distinction between "Minerals under Mining Rights" and "Minerals under Quarrying Rights", as defined in the State Council's Resolution No. 6, dated the 19th of October 192[illegible]. "Minor" minerals will thus comprise "kankar, limestone, patti katla, sand, quartz, sandstone, trap, slate,

199. The Panchpana Singhana and Sikar Thikanedars have been shown to have held all along the position of Independent Tributaries paying a tribute to Jaipur. This has been the long-established usage protected by the Treaty with the British Government in 1818. It is therefore a matter of no moment whether the minerals are major or minor. If no such rights have been exercised by the

ochres, marble, granite, ballast, cheza stone and pottery clay"; while all other minerals, including precious stones, metals, coal and oil, will come within the category of "major" minerals.

Jaipur State in these areas before, there can be no innovation now.

It is very necessary to note that the Jaipur State has never exercised any mining rights in Panchpana Singhana and Sikar.

As regards Quarries, whenever any material has been required by the Jaipur State for Public Buildings the State has always taken the permission of the Thikana concerned before taking the materials.

Part V—CUSTOMS DUTIES

201 In the Mogul system under Aurangzeb, there was a clear distinction between Customs Duties, properly so called, on the import of foreign goods, and unauthorized levies on the transit and local sale of commodities within the country. The Customs Duties on imports were levied at 2½% *ad valorem* from Mahomedans and at 5% from Hindus The "Abwab", or levies on internal trade, comprised (*a*) "Duties on the local sale of produce, like the municipal octroi duty of certain towns in modern India" (known locally as "Mapa"), and (*b*) "Rahdari", a road police tax or inland transit duty, levied by local officers, Jagirdars and Zamindars "At every fort, ferry, hill, pass or provincial boundary, toll of one-tenth of the value of the goods was taken on the passing merchandize as wages for guarding the road" (Sarkar II A Vol V 316 *et seq* and III 78) "These imposts were again and again declared by the Muhammadan

Part V.—CUSTOMS DUTIES.

204. This paragraph explains that the local State Customs were originally levies declared illegal by successive Emperors but made universally by each and every Jagirdar or Zamindar on passing goods within the limits of his territory.

It must be here recalled that it was precisely this kind of levy within the local limits of Jaipur proper that was being made by the nobles on goods passing through their estates and it was to stop this levy by every petty landholder in Jaipur proper that the 7th Article of the much stressed articles *of agreement was framed It had no* reference to the collection of customs duties, "rusum-i-rahdari", in ilaqa ghair. This is very frankly admitted in the next paragraph, and a further admission

Sovereigns to be illegal, and forbidden within their realms; but they soon reappeared" (Sarkar M.A. 120)

205 It is from these irregular levies on internal trade that the local State Customs Tariff originally developed Such taxes on local sales and on internal transits seem always to have flourished in the Jaipur State They are known now-a-days as "galtan" (tax at the place of consumption) and "bahtan" (tax on transit) In the old papers they appear as "mapa" (weighing charges) and "rahdari" (road police tax) They were, in khalsa areas, commonly leased out by the State to Farmers (Ijaredars) of particular areas; but in Thikanas—or, at any rate, in those Thikanas with which I am concerned—they were left with the Thakur The local system, of course, as in Mogul India, "opened a wide door to oppression and unauthorized exaction".

comes in the paragraph succeeding, *i. e.*, paragraph 206, that even when in 1870 the Jaipur State promulgated a Qanun Rahdari, or Customs Law, it was not applied to ilaqa ghair, *viz*: "Sikar, Khetri, Panchpana Singhana, Khandela, Udaipurwati, Patan or Uniara." The only conceivable reason for not applying the customs law in "Ilaqa ghair," foreign territory, must be that it is territory outside the laws of the State and hence called "ghair".

205. The illegal levy of paragraph 204 becomes the irregular levy of paragraph 205.

When "the local State customs tariff originally developed" from these irregular levies made by every Zamindar and Jagirdar it must be inferred that the State laid claim to the right to make these levies and denied its jagirdars right to them. But it was admitted that its Bhumia Zamindars had certain Zamindari rights in this connection which they would *continue* to exercise.

In consequence, no doubt, of the prevalent practice and because it left the difficulties to be settled by other parties, the State used to lease the right to collect these customs in Khalsa areas. But in the Thikanas with which the Report is concerned, there was no attempt made to levy such duties even by leas-

ing them. One would think that nothing could be clearer than this to prove that the State never had, or purported to have, any right to customs duties in these Thikanas. It is exactly consonant with this conclusion that the Jaipur State never, even from the remotest times, levied any duties in these areas. It is said that it opened the door to oppression and exaction. This must refer to the system of farming the right to these transit duties by the Jaipur State, for the British records of the period between 1818 and 1838 shows that merchants preferied to send their goods through Sikar rather than through Jaipur owing to the high customs duties demanded in Jaipur State.

206 The construction of a railway line through the Jaipur State seems to have come under discussion with the Government of India in 1865, and in 1868 H. H the Maharaja agreed to surrender all transit and other duties on goods passing *by rail* through his territory (Aitcheson III p 56) In the same year—presumably as the result of the grievous famine that was raging at the time—all duties on the import, export and transit of food-grains were abolished The prospective development of rail-borne traffic drew attention to the existing restrictions on trade. The first document I have found which indicates the development of a State's Customs System, properly so called, is entitled, significantly enough, the "Qanun Rahdari" of

206. This paragraph, as already stated, proves that though there was a Qanun Rahdari promulgated for the whole state it was never applied to the Independent Tributaries.

Says the Report "They were treated for customs purposes as ilaqa ghair; and no system of Chaukis or other State Agency was introduced into any of them for the enforcement of the new tariff."

It is again as clear as daylight that the promulgation of the Qanun Rahdari for the whole State, with no attempt made to act on it in the Ilaqa ghair, the Independent Tributary States, recognised most distinctively that they were not

1870. Although the old road transit duties and taxes on the movement of goods within the State were maintained, nevertheless this Qanun Rahdari imposed a uniform tariff on imports from, and exports to, foreign territory (*ilaqa gair*), with a fair proportion of assessments *ad-valorem*. It is a remarkable circumstance that this new Qanun Rahdari, through formally promulgated for the whole State, did not so far as I can ascertain, take effect in Sikar, Khetri, Panchpana-Singhana apart from from Khetri, Khandela, Udaipurwati, Patan or Umara. These Estates all lie in compact blocks on the borders of the Jaipur territory; they were treated for customs purposes as *ilaqa gair*, and no system of "chaukis", or other State agency, was introduced into any of them for the enforcement of the new tariff. The "Galtan-Bahtan" system, no doubt, continued in these Thikanas as before.

part of Jaipur proper and therefore no "Chaukis or other State Agency was introduced" in these Territories even as late as 1870.

The reason is clear! These dependencies were to be subject to Jaipur State "according to long established usage" as set out in the Treaty with the British Government in 1818. That being the, case there could be no introduction of any estate Agency for collecting customs in the dependencies when there never had been one before. The circumstance would have been more remarkable if it had been introduced than appears to the writer of the Report to be the case because it was not introduced. The effort to introduce such an unprecedented interference would have raised a protest at once.

The promulgation throughout Jaipur noticed in this paragraph is the same formula as is used in the case of the Excise and other Acts which, it will be admitted, do not take effect in Shekhawatti.

207. I have found no papers which throw any light upon the reasons for excluding these Thikanas from the operation of the new Customs Tariff. It may have been due, simply to the fact that the border Estates had long enjoyed internal autonomy; and the State Authorities at the time did not see their way to introduce without friction the

207. This paragraph states that no papers are found to explain why these Shekhawatti Thikanas are excluded from the operation of the New Customs Tariff of 1870.

There are no papers to show that the Jaipur State before the New Customs

subordinate staff needed to work the tariff at a profit More probably, the Government of India who had for many years accepted the principle of non-interference by the State in the domestic affairs of these Thikanas, "excepting in so far as may be absolutely requisite for the preservation of the general tranquillity") regarded with approval the introduction of State Police and Judicial Courts for the smaller Estates, but were not prepared to admit any further "encroachments" by a State agency in matters unconnected with the maintenance of law and order This, however, is mere surmise on my part, as the State papers do not refer to the subject while the British official records are not available to me All I can be certain of is that, in disregard of the seventh of the long-forgotten Articles of Agreement of 1818, which stated that "of old the duty levied on merchandise is the right of the Darbar and to the Darbar it shall belong" (*Az qadim rasum-i-rahdari haqq-i-Darbar ast, dar Darbar Khwahad mand*), the Qanun Rahdari of 1870 was not, in practice, applied to any of the Thikanas dealt with in this report, which stand to this day outside the Customs Cordon of the State.

Tariff of 1870 ever exercised any customs rights in this area. There is none to show that it has ever exercised any such rights even after it passed this Qanun Rahdari. There were no attempts to set up any administrative "Chaukis or other State Agency" in this Territory. There was the treaty plump and plain of 1818 which governed the rights of the Jaipur State over the dependencies by long-established usage. These factors all irresistibly lead one to the same conclusion—*Viz*: the State never had any customs rights in these outside ilaqas and never suggested that it had. But then comes along that hardy annual, the Articles of Agreement of 1818, with its Article 7 so construed as to include within its radius the ilaqa ghair. How can this help? Sir David Ochterlony had advised that the Maharajah "should declare his intention to continue every Chief in his ancient Rights and domains", Appendix H Part I Clause 4.

He personally assured them that "the Maharajah had pledged himself that the Chiefs who were obedient and well disposed should enjoy their ancient rights and domains." The treaty assured them that they would be governed "according to long-established usage". The usage is there. These Thikanedars have always enjoyed these customs duties however crudely levied. Yet it is said, mirabile dictu, that the Jaipur State has this

right and the "Articles of Agreement" are trotted out to cover it.

The paragraph has correctly stated the principle of the Government of India of non-interference in the domestic affairs of these Thikanas "excepting in as far as may be absolutely requisite for the preservation of the general tranquility" and that it was therefore "not prepared to admit any further encroachment by a State Agency in matters unconnected with the maintenance of law and order." In the face of the 8th Clause in the treaty of 1818 that the dependents of the Jaipur Maharajah were to continue to be governed according to long-established usage; it is impossible to see how the Government of India could sanction any further interference. It is impossible to understand how any further interference can be justified in the Territory of Independent Tributary Chiefs. That this was the Status of the Shekhawati Thikanedars as proved by the British Records, the statements of Historians and also on a proper understanding of the Jaipur State Papers, has been established in the earlier part of this Reply.

208. The metre-gauge Rajputana-Malwa Railway, under construction from 1874 onwards, was completed in 1881. In 1882 H. H. Sawai Madhosingh, who had recently received his powers, was led to recognize the evils of mere transit duties, as such,

208. This paragraph is dealing in affect with the engagement made by the Jaipur State in 1884 with the British Government which is to be found in Vol: III of Aitchison's Treaties,

and agreed "that the transit duties, levied by the different States on goods passing by the trade routes which serve as feeders to the Rajputana State Railway, *greatly hamper the inland trade of Rajputana*; and that one of the important objects in opening the railway line has hence not been realized" (Letter to the Resident, dated the 5th of December, 1882) He, therefore, ordered the abolition of transit duties on goods passing by *railway feeder roads*; while enhanced import, export, transit and Mapa rates on opium were imposed In 1884 the young Maharaja *went further* and "*gave up all* transit duties whatever, throughout the Jaipur State, with the exception only of those levied on opium and other intoxicating drugs"; and it was clearly stated, on this occasion, that "the remission will apply not only to the transit duties now *levied by the State* but *also to those taken* by Jagirdars and Mamlaguzars" — an assertion of His Highness' general prerogative, but an admission of the existence of some separate, though subordinate, control. This decision roused opposition among the Thikaneders On the 20th of April, 1884, *the Thikana Vakils in Shekhawati wrote* to the Nazim of that district saying that, as the abolition of transit duties affected a long-standing source of income, they could not accept the responsibility of signing, in token of acceptance, the order prohibiting them; and they suggested *that a reference be made direct to the* Sardars concerned. The Nazim was, therefore, authorized by the State Council to give a copy of the Darbar's order to the Vakils and, at the same time, to issue letters to the Thikanas under his own Rajputana, Jaipur Section. The British Government introduced throughout India in that year the abolition of duties on goods passing through any territory *i. e*, goods in transit. This being made a law universally applicable throughout India by the Paramount Power, The British Government, the protest made by the Sikar Thikana was naturally ineffectual. It is important to notice that the abolition of Rahdari in 1922 by the Minority Administration with regard to internal road traffic referred only to Jaipur proper. No such prohibition was promulgated or effected in Shekhawatti.

signature. In the case of Sikar, Khetri and Uniara the Council, on the 29th of June, 1884, sent copies of the general order direct On Sawan Badi 4 St. 1941 (1884 A D) the Rao Raja of Sikar made an *independent protest against* the Darbar's order, in view of the financial loss it was likely to cause him His representation was sent both direct to the Council and also through the Nazim of Shekhawati; but was filed under the Council's orders. It may be noticed, incidentally, that this prohibition of transit duties did not involve the prohibition of Rahdari on internal road traffic, which continued until its abolition by the recent Minority Administration in 1922

209 The preparation of a tariff under the Qanun Rahdari of 1870 was demanded, of course, by the advent of the railway, but the railway did not, for many years, traverse any of the Thikanas outside the Customs Cordon, and there the old system of "Galtan-Bahtan" or "Mapa-Rahdari" seems to have continued as before The Rewari-Phulera Chord extension of the B B & C I Railway was constructed in 1905 This line also avoided the "ilaqa gair" Thikanas; though it passed between Khetri and Patan and close to both, and stimulated in the former Estate the beginnings of a Customs system. Again, the first section of the Jaipur State Railway from Jaipur to Sawai Madhopur, built in 1905-7, barely touched the Uniara Thikana. Between 1916 and 1921, however, the metre-gauge State Railway was extended, first, to Ringas (an outlying village belonging to the Sikar Thikana); then to Palsana (in the Khandela Thikana); then to Sikar

209. This paragraph notes that, as the profits from customs duties increased owing to the facilities given to traders by the introduction of Railways, interference with these rights was attempted.

itself in 1922; then to Nawalgarh (a Thikana of Jhunjhunuwati), and, finally, in 1924 to Jhunjhunu, the chief centre of the Panchpana tract. The resulting stimulus to trade and the facilities provided for the taxation of foreign imports and exports by rail, at once concentrated attention upon the question of Customs tariffs and upon the right of the Thikanas to enjoy them.

210. Khetri was the first in the field. In 1924 the Superintendent took exception to the system under which the Jaipur State charged a transit duty on goods which passed, without breaking bulk, between foreign territory and his Thikana. He pointed out that the levy of such a transit duty was inconsistent with the State's own regulations. Mr (now Sir Leonard) Reynolds, President of the Council under the Minority Administration, accepted the argument, and conceded the Thikana the right to receive, free of Customs duty, goods imported by road or rail from foreign territory, provided bulk was not broken in the Jaipur State; and this concession was extended not only to Khetri but to the whole of Shekhawati, so far as it was treated as 'ilaqa gair', on the 7th of July, 1925. The same concession was conferred on the Patan Thikana by Council Resolution No. 16, dated the 19th of November, 1931, and on the Uniara Thikana by Council Resolution No. 40, dated the 24th of December, 1930.

210. The Khetri Thikana in 1924—then under the Jaipur Court of Wards—took exception to the State charge of transit duty on goods coming from beyond and passing through Jaipur, without breaking bulk, to Khetri territory. The argument was accepted and applied to all Shekhawatti in 1925 and later to Uniara and Patan. This most certainly was an admission that goods were still in transit while passing through Jaipur on their way to these Thikanas and had not, on crossing the Jaipur border, come into one and the same territory as the Thikanas. That is, these Thikanas for customs purposes were not a part of Jaipur. This was entirely consonant with all previous usage. The fact that the Khetri Thikana, then under the Court of Wards Jaipur, was permitted to put up this very just objection and all the Thikanas were able to get a ruling in their favour speaks very highly of the very constitutional way in which the minority administration was conducted.

211 In the course of discussion of the question of transit duties on foreign goods, to which reference has been made in the preceding paragraph, Mr Reynolds had, somewhat rashly, expressed the opinion that "the Raj has recognized the right of the Shekhawati Thikanas to levy their own Customs Duties" Accordingly, when Khetri submitted proposals for "the revision of Customs Duties," a regular Customs Tariff was formally approved for that Thikana by the State Council's Resolution No 11, dated the 5th of May, 1926 The Minority Administration under Mr Reynolds does not seem to have realized that it was, in effect, conferring a new right upon Khetri The Superintendent had reported that, under the old system (which he proposed to abolish) there were not only transit duties, properly so called, and inter-village duties (the old Bahtan or Rahdari) but also rates of duty which "varied considerably both in extent and in form" in every one of the five small Tahsils of the Thikana and which were levied, for the most part, per cart, per bullock, per camel or per maund Moreover the Khetri Estate—except the more recently acquired parganah of Kotputli and taluq of Babai—is fragmented It comprises a scattered half-share of the old Singhana parganah and a scattered one-sixth share of the old Jhunjhunu and Narhar parganahs; and a glance at the map which accompanies this report will suffice to show that an effective Customs tariff for an individual Thikana in that area is impracticable. It was, certainly, an arguable position that the so-called Customs System in Khetri prior to 1926 was, in practice, hardly to

211. This paragraph holds that the admission by Mr. Reynolds that the Raj has recognised the right of the Shekhawatti Thikanedars was "somewhat rashly" made. But the long-established exercise of the right by the Shekhawatti Thikanas and never at any time the exercise of the right by the Jaipur State with the long-established usage laid down by the Treaty of 1818 are too explicit for such an admission to be classed as somewhat rash.

It is shown in the Report, that the old system of Rahdari levies was crude (paragraph 204, 205) and was amended in Jaipur in 1870 (paragraph 209). The Khetri Thikana being under the Jaipur Court of Wards, there was an excellent opportunity for the revision of the Customs Duties and a regular Customs Tariff was formally approved by the State Council on 5th May, 1926. If it was, as the Report says, hardly to be distinguished from the old mapa Rahdari out of which "the local State Customs Tariff originally developed" (para 205), this Thikana was following, under Jaipur State control, the same line of improvement in administration as had been adopted by Jaipur itself in 1870; but, as a matter of fact, the customs tariff had been adjusted by Rajah Ajit Singh Bahadur some 30 years before and included both import and export duties.

be distinguished from the old "mapa-rahdari" system—being little more than levies on the sale of produce in the local bazars, together with transit duties on all moving merchandize Nevertheless, the new Customs Tariff for the Thikana received the formal sanction of the State's Council

To class this as "in effect the conferring of a new right on Khetri" is as much to say that it would have been all right if the revision of Duties had been sanctioned without the word "customs" for all the duties under the revision had been levied before, but were now made uniform in all parts of the Thikana and levied on modern lines.

212 Khetri's success naturally raised expectations among the other Thikanedars outside the Customs Cordon A Panchpana Executive Committee was formed, of which the Superintendent of Khetri was appointed President; a Customs Reform Scheme was launched and a Customs Chauki was established at Jhunjhunu. This led to vigorous protests to the State Council from the mercantile interest, which in turn led to a full investigation of the facts of the case by the State Customs Department. From the Departmental report of the 19th of May, 1928, it appeared that the crudest forms of taxation on trade had been in force in Jhunjhunuwati A tax known as Zakat was levied at a conventional rate per camel, per cart, per headload, per bundle or per maund. The rates were standardized by long usage; and the privilege of collecting them was frequently farmed to Ijaredars Superior castes (eleven in all) were exempted from the tax. If it was not farmed out, the right of collection was enjoyed by the Thikana to which the camel conveying the goods belonged "Khuntabandi" (a sort of

212. This records the fact that similar upto-date reform was sought to be carried out in all Panchpana Thikanas, but what it does not show is that an attempt was being made to raise the duty on certain articles and lower it on others. This was objected to by the wealthy traders as it hit them and they took the matter up to the State Council. Incidentally it may be noted that it seems incorrect to say that "The right to collection was enjoyed by the Thikanedar to whom the camel belonged." The duty was paid on arriving at destination and belonged to the Thikanedar of that district.

Khuntabundi was and is not "bahtan." It was and is in the nature of a license tax on any animal kept for transport of goods.

Bahtan) was also levied, while taxes on salt and sugar were collected, contrary to the clauses in this regard in the British Treaty with the Jaipur State drawn up in 1879 The Zakat seems to have been levied on the outskirts of each important village through which the merchandize had to pass. It was described as "a local taxation, levied from a given class of people at a given rate and in a stated manner, which was never amended or altered up to the year 1924"

213 On this report being laid before Mr Glancy, the last President of the Council during the recent Minority, he disassociated himself from the view that the mere exclusion of certain Thikanas from the State Customs Cordon in itself constituted an admission of the right of those Thikanas to levy Customs Duty. He pointed out that, by long-standing practice, all that the Sardars of Shekhawati possessed was "a kind of seignorial right to levy so much per maund or per head-load or camel-load on goods entering or leaving their domains......As opposed to this toll, the right to levy Customs duty, properly so called, is a sovereign right appertaining to the Darbar and to no lower authority" As regards Khetri the President observed: "It is, I think, to be regretted that the proposal of the Superintendent to introduce a revised customs tariff has been accepted by the Council;" and the Council resolved, on his recommendation, that "the Panchpana Thikanas be informed that, in the absence of clear evidence in support of their claim, the State Council cannot recognize their right to levy Zakat charges higher

213. This paragraph gets back to the point taken up in the early part of paragraph 212. Mr. Glancy seems to have given expression to an obiter dictum about customs which would, before it could be applied to these Thikanas, have required a determination of the rights of the Jaipur State as Suzerain in these Thikanas and how far any interference in the internal administration of these Territories can be introduced in face of the treaty of 1818. However, the Council resolved very wisely to keep off these difficult questions and resolved that the Panchpana Thikanas were to be informed that the State Council cannot recognise their right to levy higher Zakat charges than those shown to have been in force up to 1924 A. D. This left the bigger question untouched. Had it been determined adversely, it would have been necessary to take steps for rectification.

than those which are shown to have been in force up to 1924 A. D." (Resolution No. 20, dated the 11th of June, 1930).

214. On the analogy of this case, similar orders were passed by the Council in regard to the Patan Thikana by Resolution No 16, dated the 19th of November, 1930. It was agreed that Patan should "be treated on a line with the Shekhawati Thikanas; and the Customs Cordon be continued on the Jaipur-Patan border as heretofore"; but it was also decided that "the Thikana be instructed not to make changes in the existing rates without the previous sanction of the Darbar."

214. This paragraph refers to the order passed in the case of Patan Thikana, with which this Reply is not concerned.

215. In 1930 an attempt was made by the Minority Administration to reach a final settlement. The President discussed the case informally with the Agent to the Governor-General and the Resident; and "all were inclined to agree with the opinion, which appears to be unanimously held by Members of Council, that the only ultimate solution is to buy out the interests of the Thikanas concerned and to establish a cordon of Customs Chaukis round the frontier of the State;" and the suggestion was made that compensation should be calculated for individual Thikanas either on past receipts over a period of five years or on population. When the resumption of their privileges was discussed with the Thikanedars, it soon became evident that "the Sardars would never be willing to forego their rights and agree to the establishment of Raj Chaukis in Shekhawati, unless considerable

215. This paragraph shows that in 1930 the question came before the Agent to the Governor General, the Resident, and the President of the Minority Administration.

It was realised that the Thikanas concerned could only be bought out. What else does that mean than that they had long-established rights protected by the Treaty?

When the proposal of such purchase was put before the Thikanedars it became evident that the Sardars would never be willing to forego their rights unless considerable pressure were brought to bear on them.

It is probable that if there were a tribunal consisting of an equal number

pressure is brought to bear upon them", and that "further negotiations with them would not be profitable" This is how the matter stands at the moment

of nominees appointed by the State and appointed by the Thikanedars with an Umpire to whose appointment both parties consented, the difficulty of a settlement of the question would disappear. In all such questions it is the fear of not getting an equal representation on the tribunal that makes settlement impossible. There should be no such thing as "considerable pressure."

216 The present position may be summarized as follows: In Jhunjhunuwati, or the area held by the Penchpana-Singhana Thakurs other than Khetri, inquiry has disclosed that they do not, even at the present time, exercise rights which can be described as the equivalent of Customs rights My own informal inquiries indicate that the same position obtains in Udaipurwati, which is held by a number of Thikanedars, the fragmentation of whose Thikana has reduced them to the position locally of Bhumias. In Khetri the Customs rights of the Thikana have been admitted by the State; but this was done by a Minority Administration and without regard for the point of view subsequently presented to the State Council in dealing with Jhunjhunuwati In Patan the State has already asserted its rights to the extent of prohibiting any modification of the existing rates except with the previous approval of the Darbar. For Sikar, Uniara and Khandela no inquiry has been held and the exact position cannot be defined My own information is that in all these four Thikanas (Patan, Sikar, Uniara and Khandela) there is, at the

216. Such rights of customs as are exercised in the various Thikanas enumerated are the only rights which are exercised in those areas. The Jaipur State does not exercise and never has exercised any customs rights therein. In Khetri the matter has been definitely settled, but by a special pleading, which can always be adopted, the admission made by Mr. Reynolds that "the Raj has recognised the right of the Shekhawati Thikanas to levy their own customs Duties", and the Resolution passed in accordance therewith, it is to be outflanked by a suggestion that the levy of the Thikanedars "on goods entering or leaving their domains" should be called "a kind of seignorial right" (paragraph 213) but the Jaipur State should make a levy on the outer border of Shekhawati territory and thereafter forbid the right of all the Thikanedars to levy any further dues on the ground that these would be inter-state duties. This apparently is what is foreshadowed. It would obviously result in very great loss

present day, a system of assessment on imports and exports. At the same time it is probable that this development is no more than a comparatively recent modification of the old Mapa Rahdari system.

217. The view now held by the State is that the Customs rights of those Thikanas which lie outside the Customs Cordon (*in Ilaqa Gair*) *have not yet been* established. The Customs rights of the Khetri Thikana were admitted during the Minority, and the question of revision, therefore, presents special difficulties. The State refuses to admit the claim of Thikanedars in Ilaqa Gair to the exercise of Customs rights. Certainly the mere fact these Thikanas have been left outside the Customs Cordon cannot, in my opinion, in itself create in their favour a presumption that they enjoy a right to the levy of Customs duties. The essential considerations are :—

(a) That, historically, the Jaipur Darbar may be regarded as having through its treaty with the British Government in 1818, succeeded, in respect of Customs and within the limits *of its own territory, to the rights* which were formerly exercised by the Moguls. The Mapa and Rahdari levies, taken both by the State itself and by the Thikanas, were, in Mogul times, no more than irregular Abwabs wholly distinct from Customs Duties, properly so called; and their levy by certain Thikanas cannot be regarded either as indicating the exercise by them of a Customs right *to all the* Thikanedars and deprive them of rights which they always enjoyed according to longestablished usage extending over 200 years.

217. It is on the above basis said that the view now held by the State is that the customs right of these Thikanas has not yet been established. Seeing that they alone have been exercising these rights, however primitive their method may be, and have done so without interruption from the State for the last two hundred years, it does seem rather extraordinary to say that they have not yet established their rights because they *called them Rahdari and not customs.* It is admitted that the Jaipur State's customs rights were levied under exactly the same method and nomenclature originally, see paragraph 205, and were even in 1870 called Qanun Rahdari. This argument must be accepted because paragraph 206 purports to show that customs law was promulgated throughout Jaipur and the Tributary States by a "Qunun Rahdari" of 1870. ..

The mere fact of lèaving the Thikanas outside the customs cordon might not have been conclusive if there had been no customs duties realised by any one in those territories, but when it is admitted that the Thikanedars have all along levied these duties in their territories "on goods

or as creating a Customs right in their favour

(b) Transit dues were prohibited by Maharaja Madhosingh in 1884 throughout the length and breadth of the Jaipur State This order was promulgated for the whole of His Highness' territory, although it is certain that the Thikanas with which I am now concerned were, at the time, being treated as *ilaqa gair.* This was a clear assertion by the Maharaja of his sovereign rights over the Thikanas in regard to the control of Customs

(c) Customs rights are normally regarded as sovereign rights This is so not only in a general way (see para 192); it can also be specifically predicated of the Jaipur State by virtue of the Settlement of the 21st of June, 1818, between the Maharaja and his Thakurs The seventh Article of the Agreement then drawn up clearly states that "Of old the duty on merchandize is the right of the Darbar; and to the Darbar it shall belong"

entering or leaving their domains" (paragraph 213), it seems that the long-established usage of these rights has been completely established. To change the name of the claim to Transit duties, from Rahdari to customs, and say that the Thikanedars had right to Rahdari but not to customs seems a strange argument when it is said that the Qanun Rahdari of 1870 is the Customs law.

(a) Historically the Moghul never levied customs duties in Rajputana. Import and Export duties were taken at the ports, while Mapa and Rahdari were not only not levied by the Moghul but declared illegal, though they were levied by the various local landowners through whose properties goods passed. They are regarded as the origin of the rights of the State, paragraph 205, but are not the origin of the rights of the Thikanedars. How illogical. The Treaty with the British Government did not purport to confer on the Jaipur State any new Imperial Status but took away some of its Sovereign rights while leaving others with it. It is impossible to argue that the Jaipur State acquired any further rights by the Treaty of 1818 than it had before and certainly there was no new acquisition of rights in the Thikanedars' Territories. The Moghul Emperors themselves never exercised such rights in the Thikanedars' territories, therefore there could be no

inheritance of these rights from the Moghul By *the 8th Clause of the* treaty no new right could be acquired in the territories of Dependencies They *were to be only subject* according to long-established usage There was no usage of customs duties, admittedly, by *the Jaipur State in these Thikanas*. Historically, therefore, the claim put forward for the Jaipur State will not hold.

(b) The prohibition of transit duties on goods passing through without breaking bulk was *prohibited* by the *Government* of India throughout all India and by the engagement set out in Aitchison's Treaties *Vol: III Rajputana, Jaipur Section. It* was promulgated in Jaipur in uniformity with the rule laid down for all India. *This, the act of the Paramount Power,* was made law for Jaipur and through the Maharajah of Jaipur was enjoined on *his dependents It does not touch the* question to be determined here The Report realises that even then this had no *reference to internal transit duties* which were abolished in Jaipur in 1922 but not touched in Shekhawati. So far from *being a clear assertion of his* rights by the Maharajah of Jaipur it was a clear assertion . of Paramount Power *by the Government of India.* It affected every Ruler big and small, but did not give any Ruler any rights he *had never before* held or exercised.

(c) Naturally one comes in the last line of attack to the Agreement of 1818.

As has been said so often already, this refers to the duty that of old had been the right of the Darbar. If it had been shown that this duty had ever been realised in Shekhawati by the Durbar, then it would belong under this clause to it. If it had of old belonged, but not been exercised, it might be inferred to belong to it. If, however, it has always been exercised by the Thikanedars under the name Rahdari, then it has neither belonged to the State nor been enjoyed by it, but has always been enjoyed by the Thikanedars, and by Clause 8 of the treaty in April 1818 they are entitled to it by long-established usage.

Finally, the Sikar paper S. R. 76 bearing General Ochterlony's signed order of 29-7-1818 that "If owing to customs duty the horse has been seized, then there is no objection. You may take the proper amount of customs duty" proves conclusively that the agreement of June 1818 had no reference to customs duties in Shekhawatti.

218 The correct procedure would be for His Highness the Maharaja to assert his right to levy Customs Duties along the entire length of the Jaipur State border - a sovereign right to which he

218. The effect of this suggestion would be such a grievous blow to the Thikanedars' prestige and rights that they feel it impossible to accede to it.

is entitled as Ruler of the State and also by virtue of the Settlement of 1818 The Customs "rights" of the Thikanedars should be rejected as without authority, except in the case of Khetri For Khetri the matter should be discussed with the Government of India, as the Customs rights of that Thikana were recognized during the Minority Administration This was, in effect, a surrender of an important State right, which should not have been made under standing orders, without the official sanction of the Resident

It would entirely destroy the protection given them by the Treaty of 1818, whereunder they are entitled to be maintained in all rights enjoyed by them in accordance with long-established usage. If this right is taken away, then there is no saying where the encroachments will stop. They are compelled therefore to reject the proposal

219. The Thikanedars, other than Khetri, should be given compensation not for their Customs rights, which the State challenges, but for the vested interests which they have acquired owing to their Thikanas being left outside the Customs Cordon of the State The levies on trade imposed by these Thikanedars are based upon long-established practice; and the Thikanedars should, therefore, receive reasonable compensation for their withdrawal The character and extent of that compensation will naturally vary for each Thikanedar, and will depend upon an estimated valuation of the customary rights or perquisites which each is being called upon to surrender The preparation of such an estimated valuation will require careful local inquiry; and is a matter upon which I am not in a position, at present, to offer any useful opinion

219 It is said that "The levies on trade imposed by the Thikanedars are based upon long-established practice." This is again a distinction without a difference similar to "Rahdari" and customs. If it had been phrased "long-established usage," the Treaty would have come in on a full tide and submerged the whole argument.

GENERAL SUMMARY

The whole misconception of the position of the Thikanedars has arisen from construing the position of the Tributaries from the old State papers and on the view formed from those papers, of concluding that all the British Official Records, all the Histories and all the traditions must be wrong. But how this extraordinary discrepancy as to the true Status was to be reconciled was found unanswerable in the Report and left to the Political Department (paragraph 45).

This prodigious variation has a very simple origin. The Thikanedars, as the local Chieftains in their areas, were given and were ready to take the subleases of the tribute due on their Territories. To take a case beyond argument. Sardul Singh certainly had properties in Udaipurwati and in Singhana, and the subleases of his newly acquired territories included these villages. So that it was quite possible to be both landowner and sublessee. This is actually recognised by the Report in paragraph 77. See also reply to 77. As however the State papers deal almost solely with the sublessee rights of the Thikanedars, there is very little mention of their rights as landowners. It is just in a few papers that this Status can be seen. Even these have been misunderstood and the inference has been drawn that the ijaredar Thikanedars were only ijaredars.

This conclusion, of mere ijaredar or sublessee, did not require any reference to the class, very frequently referred to in Moreland's "Agrarian System in Moslem India," which he calls Chiefs. Other writers also refer to this class of big landowners, but Moreland is sufficient. Ignoring all his statements that Chiefs were prevalent in Rajputana and that they were only liable to pay tribute, that they were there both big and small, even though the Ain, dealing with pergannahs only, could not refer to them; ignoring the method the Chiefs had of realising the tribute; ignoring the evidence that from their position the Jaipur Rajahs were not subject to close Moghul control, and from the inaccessible nature of the tributary Chiefs, that they were equally not under close Moghul control but also paid a lumpsum tribute, the Report starts with the basis that the whole of Jaipur was under close Moghul control and therefore that there were no Chiefs and therefore that kind of tenure need not be considered. This left a peasant owner class alone to be considered. Therefore the Tributary Chiefs must fit in as mere contractors

imported by Maharajah Jai Singh to collect, in sub-contract from him, the Revenue due from the peasantry, he, in his turn, paying over, so much of it as he had contracted to pay to the Mahomedan Official whose salary was realisable from the area covered by the contract

The number of Musalman Jagirdars leads to no inference about the nature of the tribute or revenue payable That is to say, the same number of Musalman Jagirdars would appear in either case. The tribute, in Chiefs country, the Revenue, in peasant areas, was apportioned out to the Moghul Officials in payment of their salaries It was in Rajputana, says Moreland, mostly Chiefs country.

The taking of these ijaras or contracts from the Officials for the realisation of their salaries from the tribute payable by turbulent Chiefs was very profitable to Jaipur State. By the natural plan of sub-contracting it to the local Chieftain, realisation was fairly simple. The latter added a certain amount for himself either as collecting charges or by overstating the amount authorised to be collected and thus rendered it worth his while to undertake collection.

This taking of farms in areas adjoining the Jaipur State was not the cause of Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh II attaining Political authority. This was a very insignificant part of his activities. He was a world figure on the stage of his day, as is shown by quotations from Tod and Irvine's "Later Mughals." Jaipur State came into prominence due to the high positions held by successive Jaipur Maharajahs at the Imperial Court and their prowess in the field of War. These factors secured them great wealth long before the days of ijaras. Maharajah Jai Singh's powerful political alliances, coupled with his large military forces, and not the harvesting of pay contracts, gave him the dominant position which he held.

The wealth that he and his predecessors had amassed withstood the drain made on it in later years by the Mahrattas and other predatory forces. Whatever may have been the ill defined position of the Tributary Chieftains before, it was crystalised for the future by the Treaty of 1818 with the British Government.

That position was not to be found in any document, that is certain. It had therefore to depend on long-established usage. After the close of the Moghul Power in 1750 — apart from fitful recoveries round about the year 1780, — the Chieftains paid tribute to the power who could exact it or the power who could best protect them. In the main it was paid to Jaipur, under the compulsion of the obvious advisability of paying the most capable protector. This becomes very clear on a study of the Political history of these regions at that period.

The ijaras (see last passage of paragraph 223) of Maharajah Sawai Jai Singh cannot be treated as chrysalises which turned into butterflies almost at once. Such a conception is too romantic. The ijaras paid. Then times so changed that they were useless and went out, but the tribute was still secured on quite other grounds — protection, and as part payment of the lumpsum assessment made by the Mahratta. This power, Tukoji Rao Holkar, Amir Khan, all were striving, to collect money from Rajputana, with lesser plunderers around *at the same period. The actual position of tribute-paying Chiefs, who paid* whoever could force payment from them or who could protect them, was not very clear. Metcalfe thought they were under no compulsion to pay any particular power.

This uncertainty was set at rest by the Treaty of 1818. The tributaries had in the main paid Jaipur; so had Ulwar, but he just escaped being treated as a tributary. Sikar might have escaped if his position had been better under-stood by Sir David Ochterlony. That treaty conclusively bound the Tributaries to Jaipur but with the intention of securing them absolute fairness. It was to be in accordance with long-established usage and no more. This treaty developed Jaipur into the position of a State with immoveable rights over its tribute-paying Chieftains. They could not break away nor could any other power wrest them from Jaipur. That the ancestors of these Shekhawati Tributaries had established themselves by clan conquest has been very completely established from a detailed examination of the materials referred to.

The object of reducing these Thikanedars to the Status of mere ijaredars is, as frankly explained in paragraph 227, to rob them of their jurisdiction within their Thikanas and their political Status. It is true that the Jaipur

State was saved from annihilation by the British, but they at the same ti
pledged themselves to maintain the dependencies in their positions in accordan
with old-established usage.

Then paragraph 228 recapitulates the conception of all the British Officer
and historians going hopelessly wrong and the settlement of 1818 is reinvoke
as the Jaipur Charter, while the treaty of 1818 is ignored.

The Government of India have adopted one consistent attitude throughou
and are unlikely to give the go by to their Policy on an interpretatio
of the Jaipur State papers which has been shown to be ill founded (See 229)

If the Status of the Thikanedars has not been successfully attacked and the idea that they were mere sublessees has not been established, the right to interfere with their internal economy will not arise and no readjustment of their existing rights will be justifiable. The three main questions referred for inquiry are said in page one of the Report to be :—

1 Whether the Tribute is liable to revision.

2 Whether the Jaipur State has a right to the minerals in the Thikanas

3 Whether the customs cordon should be (can be ?) extended so as to include the Thikanas, the subject of the Report, and, if so, should the Thikanedars get any compensation and, if so, on what basis.

To these questions the Reply has been limited, and therefore no attempt has been made to deal with the questions of Judicial, Police or Excise powers. The elimination of the position of Chiefs owning large landed estates in Rajputana has led to a complete misconception in the historical sections of the Report. The failure to realise that the ancestors of these Shekhawatti Chieftains had conquered the Country for themselves has been responsible for drawing the wrong inference as to their position

The fact that the Jaipur State papers are practically account papers and therefore only concerned with the position of the Thikanedars as sublessees has

led to the wrong inference being drawn that they had no other Status, even though some papers give every indication of their other position of landed proprietors

The mistaken theory being formed that the Thikanedars were only sublessees has led to the difficulty—found unsurmountable by the writer of the Report—of reconciling the British records and statements of historians with this theory

The necessity seems to arise of discarding the theory and reconsidering the interpretation of the State documents, when the difficulty will disappear. The Report, however, has preferred the theory and left itself with all the British Records and Histories unexplained

The Agreement of June 1818 has been misconstrued to refer to things outside its scope If kept to the matters within its scope, there is no ground for saying it was forgotten. It is only intelligible to say it was forgotten after Sir David Ochterlony had left in the end of 1825, but it is not explained why he did nothing under it for those 7 years, 1818—1825, while he was on the spot as Political Agent, with reference to those matters which are said to be covered by the clauses of the treaty.

The ground given for holding everything done by the Political Dep[illegible] ment during the last 120 years to have been under a grossly mistaken vie[illegible] the rights of the Tributaries has not been established.

It has been shown how everything coincides to prove that the th[illegible] the Report is in fault and not the Political Department. This havin[illegible] shown, the conclusion follows that no interference in the rights of the T[illegible] dars can be sprung on them now in face of the position secured for [illegible] *the Treaty of 1818*

APPENDICES.



APPENDIX B (1)

Shri Ramji

Seal

From Nawalgarh.

Kabz-ul-wasool (Receipt) in the name of Kunwar Narsingh Das Shekhwat of Rupees 1,000 (one thousand only) *i. e*, double of the half five hundred from the Sarkar of Nawab Sahib Maji-u-daula Bahadur received along with the Alamshahi 1,400/- (fourteen hundred) of Babaji Saheb Shri Nawal Singhji Bahadur through Tilok Chandji on account of Talab Kharch

Dated Phagun Badi 14 Sambat 1835
(1778 A. D.)

APPENDIX B (2)

(Translation of Receipt)

I, Lutfulla Beg, in the service of Mirza Najaf Ali Khan Bahadur, do hereby acknowledge to have received Rs 1,000/- (one thousand only), half of which amounts to Rs 500/-, from the Ahalkars of Raja Saheb Bagh Singhji on account of pay of Hazur Therefore this receipt is recorded in acquittance of the payment

Dated 7th Rabi-ul-sani Julus Year 28

DETAIL —

Cash	Rs.	535	0	0
Hundi	„	465	0	0
	Rs	1,000	0	0

Signature of Lutfulla Beg,
(1200 Hijri)
(1786 A.D.)

APPENDIX B (3)

(Translation of Receipt.)

A sum of Rs. 2,000 (two thousand only), half of which amounts to Rs. 1,000 on account of Mamla due from Thakur Bagh Singh for 1193 Fasli has been duly received through Rahim Khan Dakhni and credited in Sarkar Treasury as per details below:—

Seal of—

Iftukhar-ul-daula.

Mohammad Beg Khan.

Bahadur Firoz Jung.

1192.

On account of pay of Risala.

Mirza Ismail Khan Bahadur	Rs.	1,310	0	0
Pay of Parkh Ram Modi	Rs.	201	0	0
Pay of Khusi Mohammad Ali Khan ...	Rs.	250	0	0
Cash	Rs.	210	0	0
	Rs	2,001	0	0

Dated 28 Shawal Julus year 28.
(1200 Hijri)
(1786 A. D.)

APPENDIX B (4)

(Translation of Receipt.)

A sum of Rs. 2976-2-6 (Two thousand nine hundred and seventy six annas 2 and a half), half of which amounts to Rs 1,488-1-3, on account of Mamla of Thakur Bagh Singh for 1193 Fasli has been received and credited into the Sarkar as per details below:

Seal of—

Iftakhar-ul-daula.
Mohammad Beg Khan.
Bahadur Firoz Jung.
1192.

Through Dharam Rao	Rs. 1,000	0	0
Pay of Risala Mirza Khan Bahadur through Rahim Khan	Rs. 490	0	0
Through Sri Kishen on 25 Zikad ...	Rs 1,486	2	6
	Rs. 2,976	2	6

Dated, 25 Zikad Julus year 28.
(1200 Hijri)
(1786 A.D.)

APPENDIX B (5)

(Translation)

We Mirza Lutfulla Beg and Mirza Adil Beg in the Service of Hazoor acknowledge to have received and sent to Hazoor Rupees five hundred and twenty three annas twelve (Rs. 523-12-0) half of which comes to Rs. 261-14-0 on account of salary of Hazoor from the Ahalkars of Rajah Bagh Singh out of the revenue of Singhana for Kharif Therefore this receipt has been recorded in acquittance of the amount.

Dated 20th Jamadi-ul-sani,
Julus year 29 Sambat 1844.

Signature of Mohammad Adil Beg.
Signature of Mirza Lutfulla beg.
(1787 A D)

APPENDIX B (6)

(Translation of Receipt.)

I acknowledge to have received and credited to Sarkar a sum of Rupees five thousand nine hundred and seventy, (Rs. 5,970) half of which amounts to Rs, 2,985 on account of Nazarana and Mamla of Pargannah Loharu for Rabi 1196 Fasli through Sri Kishan Diwan of Raja Bagh Singh and Hirdi Ram Diwan of Thakur Sham Singh

Seal of Nasir-u-daula
Meer Abdul Muttahib-
Khan Nasir Jung.

Rs 5,970 half Rs 2,985

Dated 16 Shawal Julus year 31. (1203 Hijri.)
(1789 A. D.).

APPENDIX B (7)

(Translation of Receipt)

A sum of Rs. 930 in current coin, half of which comes to Rs 465, on account of Mamla of Narhar, Singhana and Jhunjhunu for 1196 Fasli year has been received through Sarup Ram and Hirde Ram Ahalkars of Thakur Nar Singh Das and credited to Sarkar.

Seal of Nasir-ud-daula Mir-
Abdul Muttahib Khan
Bahadur-Nasir Jang.
1188

Rs. 930 half of which is Rs 465

Dated 25 Ramzan Julus Year 31. (1203 Hijri).
(1789 A. D.).

APPENDIX B (8)

(Translation) of Receipt

It is hereby acknowledged that the sum of Rs 40,071 (forty thousand and seventy one only) half of which amounts to Rs 20,035-8-0 on account of Mamla of Parganah Narhar, Singhana and Jhunjhunu Talluqa Shekhawati for 1196 Fasli has been duly received and credited to Sarkar treasury through Sri Kishan Diwan of Raja Bagh Singh and Hirde Ram Ahalkar of Thakur Shyam Singh.

Rs 40071 half of which is Rs. 20,035-8.

Seal of Nasir-ud-daula Mir-
Abdul Muttahib Khan-
Bahadur Nasir Jang

1203 Hijri.
(1789 A D.).

List of some of the many Muafi grants of Customs and of charity from Customs to their people by the Panchpana Sardars.

APPENDIX C (1)

Shri Ramji.

Seal.

Written on behalf of Rajshri Nawal Singhji to Misra Sawai Ramji. On the Customs Station of Mauza Nawalgarh you have been assigned 12½ Damri......per rupee Realise the same (in future) and give blessings.

Dated Mah Sudi 3 Sambat 1798.

(1741 A.D.).

APPENDIX C (2)

Shri Ramji.

Seal Seal Seal

Written on behalf of Rajshri Nawal Singhji, Raj Shri Kesri Singhji, Raj Shri Bakhat Singhji and Bhopal Singhji to Customs Officer of Jhunjhunu town. Give Swami Ramdasji who has fixed his abode near the well, four and half pice daily by way of charity beginning from Diwali. 2/12½.

Dated Asoj Sudi 11 Sambat 1807. (1750 A.D.).

APPENDIX C (3)

Shri Ramji.

Nawal Singhji. Raghunathji.

Written on behalf of Raj Shri Nawal Singhji. *The Chobdars* of the Nawalgarh town have built the temple of Shriji... ..You will be paid two takas (*i e*, one anna) daily *from the* Customs Station Utilise it for '*Bhog'*. *Roopa* Chobdar had sunk a well but assigned it for the expenses on festivities of Shriji I *too* assign it. The rent of both the *harvests* should be deposited in the custody of Shriji 101 *bighas of* land has been made appurtenant to the well—61 for Sawan *harvest and* 40 for Katik harvest The rent of both the harvests is to be *spent for* Shriji.

(The usual 'Sloka' of an 'Udak')

Dated Phagan Badi 7 Sambat 1828. (1771 A D).

Signed Mayachand by order of Hazoor.

This patta was written at the time of joining the marriage ceremony in the temple.

APPENDIX C (4)

Sale of —

Raja Abhey Singh Shakhawat

Udai Singhji Shekhawat

Pem Singh Shekhawat,

Sham Singhji Shekhawat

Dhool Singhji Shekhawat.

Debi Singh Shekhawat

Dhir Singhji Shekhawat,

Sheo Singh Shekhawat

It is hereby written by *Raj* Shri *Dhir* Singhji, Raj Shri Udai Singh, Raj Shri Abhey Singhji, Raj Shri Sham Singhji, Raj Shri Dhool Singh, Raj Shri Pem Singhji, Raj Shri Sheo Singhji, Raj Shri Debi Singhji to Mushrafs of Customs of Jhunjhunu and Narhar that eight camels of goods of Dhabai *Doongarsi Das* are to be exported; they have been exempted from *Zakat* *Therefore* you should not dem nd any thing on that account

Dated Mah Badi 13 Sambat 1877

Note.—

1 Original with Dhangi Dhabai of Khetri

2 Received from Khetri Office

APPENDIX C (5)

(The original with Swami Sumernathji of Ajari).

Shri Ramji.

Seal of Udai Singhji	Raja Abhai Singhji	Shyam Singhji

4 more seals

Written on behalf of Rajshri Sangram Singhji, Raj Shri Udai Singhji, Rajaji Shri Abhai Singhji, Raj Shri Shyam Singhji, Rajshri Dule Singhji, Rajshri Pemsinghji Rajshri Sheoji Singhji, Rajshri Deve Singhji to the Musarafs at the Customs stations of Jhunjhunu Narhar towns.

Balaknathji the chela (disciple of.........ji) Shri Phoolnathji will import salt weighing 1,000 mds (one thousand only) every year from Didwana (in Jodhpur). The duty on that has been remitted Do not trouble him. You may realise the duty on the extra amount of salt imported. The duty on so much salt has been remitted. Do not realise it.

Dated Katik Badi 8 Sambat 1881. (1824 A.D.)

APPENDIX D—(Khetri Papers.)

List of Jaipur papers relating to "Chhoot" (deductions from Mamla) from the Mamla of Panchpana Shekhawati Sardars

Serial No.	Nature of paper	Date	To whom addressed.	Particulars.
1.	Parwana Hindi	Chait Budi 3 Sambat 1830 (1773 A D)	Mutsaddi Shekhawati	Chhoot of Rs 12,000/- annually on account of Patta to Bagh Singh Shekhawat and of Rs 3,500/- for Khetri "Inam"
2	Do	Chait Budi 6 Sambat 1830 (1773 A D)	Do.	Chhoot of Rs. 12,000/- on account of Patta
3.	Hindi letter	Mah Sudi 10 Sambat 1846 (1789 A D)	Raja Bagh Singh	Grant of Chhoot of Rs. 2 000/- annually to Bagh Singh on account of Bhayan Sarishta (brotherly relations)
4.	Parwana Hindi	Bhadon Budi 10, St. 1869	Amil of Shekawati	The amount of Chhoot on account of Bhayan Sarishta raised to Rs 6,000/-
5	Do.	Asuj Budi 9 Sambat 1873	Mutsaddi Shekhawati	Do.
6	Kharita Hindi of Major Thoresby	Jeth Sudi 9 Sambat1900	Rajaji Khetri	Settlement of Mamla account and the Chhoot items

APPENDIX D—(Khetri Paper No. 1)

Sanadi file No 4

Shri Ramji

Be it known with compliments from Dewans Prohit Bal Kishan Sewa Ram to the Mutsaddi of Shekhawati Tahsil that the Pargana of Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana etc, and the Patta of Inam has been ordered to be continued to remain in the possession of Bag Singh son of Kishan Singh grandson of Sardul Singh Shekhawat in place of his elder brother Bhopal Singh according to a writing dated Poh Bad 4 Sambat 1830 Bag Singh's elder brother Bhopal Singh received Tazim etc, and he died in the battle of Loharu on Bhadwa Badi 10 Sambat 1828 Therefore he is according to his request and on personal attendance granted the same

"Tazim" etc, as was enjoyed by his elder brother. You are hereby informed that the same status shall continue to be held by him.

You should see and comply that:—

(1) Whatever Mamla was recovered on account of Jhunjhunu, Singhana and Narhar, etc. in the past shall continue to be realised in future and the former taluqa shall continue in his possession

(2) Rs 12,000 on account of Patta and Rs. 3,500 on account of Inam for Khetri *viz* Rs. 15,500 in all which have been deducted from the Mamla up to Sambat 1829 shall also be continued to be deducted.

Dated Chait Badi 3 Sambat 1830 (1773 A. D.).

APPENDIX D—(Khetri paper No. 2.)

Translation of Jaipur Hindi letter dated Chait Badi 6th
(Sambat 1830, 1773 A. D.)

Patta of Chhoot. Sanadi file No. 99.

Shri Ramji.

Be it known from Dewan Purohit Balkishan Sewa Ram to the Mutsaddi of Tahsil Shekhawati that it is all well here and your welfare is desired. Now that the Gumashtas of Hanwant Singh, Suraj Mal and Kesri Singh the grandson of Sardul Singh Shekhawat have represented that the annual amount of Patta *i.e.*, Rs 12,000 which is received by them from Sambat 1826 in the adjustment of Mamla of Parganah Jhunjhunu and Narhar has been deducted from their "Mamla" up to Sambat 1829 but the Mutsaddi creates trouble with them for want of a Sanad to this effect, therefore it is hereby written to you in accordance with the orders of Shri Huzur that you should remit annually the Sum of Rs. 12,000 on account of Patta from their Mamla of the said Taluqa if this has been done before.

APPENDIX D—(Khetri Paper No. 3.)

Translation of Hindi letter dated Mah Sudi 10th Sambat 1846
(Patta of Choot Sanadi file No 29)

Jaipur Seal.

From Shri Dewan to Bagh Singh son of Kishan Singh Shekhawat You are *informed that a sum of Rs 2,000 on account of Chhoot of Bhayan Sarishta (given* to brothers) has also been granted to you to be remitted from your Mamla with effect from Sambat 1846

(1789 A.D)

APPENDIX D—(Khetri Paper No. 4.).

Translation of Patta of Chhoot Sanadi file No. 99

Shri Ramji

Shri Huzoor.

Jaipur Seal.

Be it known from Mishra Sheonarain to amil of Sheikhawati that it is all well here and your welfare is desired It is hereby written to you in compliance with the order of Shri Huzoor that as the amount of "Chhoot" (remission from Mamla) to Raja Abhye Singh Sheikhawat from brethren allowance (Bhayan Sarishta) was not enough therefore the amount to be remitted has been fixed at Rs 6,000 (six thousand) You should have the amount deducted annually from the Mamla of Parganas Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana due from the him.

Dated Bhadon Budi 10th Sambat 1869 (1812 A D.)

APPENDIX D—(Khetri Paper No. 5).

Traaslation of Hindi letter of Raja Prohit Maji Das "Musahib" Raj Jaipur dated Asoj, Budi 9 Sambat 1873

Be it known from Rao Bahadur Raja Prohit Manji Das to the Mutasaddi of Shekhawati that it is all well here and your welfare is desired On a representation from the Gumashta of Raja Abhye Singh Shekhawat that the amount of Choot (Remission of mamla) allowed to the Raja was less than that allowed to other Chiefs, it had been raised by the order of the Maharaja to Rs 6,000 (six thousand) and was to be deducted from the mamla of Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana but as the letter of Missar Shiva Narain dated Bhadwa Budi 10 Sambat 1869 conveying the sanction was not duly received in the office for issue on account of which the Mutasaddi objected to take the amount of chhoot as mentioned in Missar Shiva Narain's letter, had in reality been fixed at Rs 6,000 Therefore you should remit this amount from the mamla of parganas Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana.

Dated Asoj Budi 2 Sambat 1873

Signature of Rao Bahadur Raja Prohit Manji Dass.

APPENDIX D—(Khetri Paper No. 6)

Translation of order passed by Major Thoresby in the matter of settlement of account of Mamla due from Khetri to Raj Sawai Jaipur.

This case of payment of Mamla which is in dispute between the Ahalkars of Jaipur and the Kamdars of Khetri came up before me along with the documents presented by the Ahalkars and Kamdars and their oral statements. The Kamdar of Khetri presented a copy of Robkar of Col: Abraham Locket, late Resident of Rajputana, dated 8 September, 1832, in which the Ahalkars of Jaipur claimed for the recovery of Rupees 1,01,307/4/- from the Khetri Chief on account of demand from Sambat 1873 to 1888. In that Robkar the Resident passed the following order:—

The Rais of Khetri has at my hint credited Rs 1,10,714/11/- out of the total demand to Raj Jaipur on 2nd July 1832. He should from the outstanding balance pay up Rs 1,20,000/- into Raj Treasury up to Phagan Sudi 15 Sambat 1889. As for the settlement the amounts of "Chhoot" and Rozina due from Sambat 1873 to 1888, the matter should be held up till the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur attains the age of 18 years, when he shall pass orders as he desires.

The copy of Kharita of the Resident dated 8-9-1832 addressed to the Rais of Khetri filed by the Kamdar of Khetri shows that the Resident remarked in the end that if the Chief of Khetri continued to pay the Mamla from Sambat 1889 to Raj Jaipur regularly from year to year his country would remain in peace.

The Maharaja of Jaipur has not come to that age and in each year the dispute over the payment of Mamla shows that the correct amount of Mamla remains to be settled. The Kamdars of Khetri have submitted the following documents regarding the "Choot" of Rs. 8000/- including Rs. 2000/- on account of sweetmeat of Kunwar Bakhtawar Singh:—

(1) Hindi letter of Missar Sheo Narain dated Bhadwa Budi 10 Sambat 1869 to the Amil of Shekhawati regarding Choot of Rs. 6000/-

(2) Hindi letter of Missar Sheo Narain dated Baisakh Budi 5 Sambat 1870 to Amil of Shekhawati regarding Choot of Rs 2000/ on account of sweetmeat of Kunwar Bakhtawar Singh

(3) Hindi letter of Prohit Manji Dass to Mutasaddis of Shekhawati dated Asoj Budi 9 Sambat 1873 regarding "Chhoot" of Rs. 6000/-

(4) Hindi letter of Tewari Mohan Ram Nazir dated Katik Sudi 5 Sambat 1874 regarding Chhoot of Rs 6000/- and Rs. 2000/- total Rs 8000/-

(5) Hindi letter of Tewari Mohan Ram Nazir dated Katik Sudi 5 Sambat 1874 regarding Chhoot of Rs. 8000/- as above. The above five papers of the Musahibs of Raj Jaipur were shown to the officials of Jaipur who said that out of these letters the one written by Prohit Manji Dass is according to Sarista and the custom, it bearing the words Sahi and Nakal (attestation) of the Raj officials, but the letters of other Musahibs are not according to Sarista and they are not attested by the Raj officials and hence they are invalid and that one written by Prohit Manji Dass is quite right in all respects, but it was not issued

In my opinion it appears that up to Sambat 1888 the matter had been settled before Col. Locket, as is evident from his detailed Robkar and I consider that the remission of Rs 8000 annually be given to Khetri in their Mamla from Sambat 1889 to 1897 because they are in the possession of the letters of the Musahibs written under the orders of Shri Hazor and the objection of the officials of Raj Jaipur that the letters were not issued can not be accepted because the settlement of accounts never took place in the presence of the Raj and Khetri officials during this time; whatever amount was paid by Khetri from time to time it was adjusted in the Raj accounts and the receipts obtained Had the accounts been formerly settled in the presence of both sides and the remissions may have not been allowed on that occasion, then the objection about non-issue of the letter could be accepted It is true that other letters are not according to Sarishta but the letter of Prohit Manj Dass regarding Chhoot of Rs 6000 is correct in every respect and therefore Rs 6000 should be remitted annually. As for the remission of Rs 2000 on account of sweetmeat the letters do not bear the attestation of Raj officials and are doubtful and so it should be disallowed with effect from the Sambat 1898 It seems that the late Maharaja Sahib's view was that the Chhoot of Rs 2000 should not be given for the sweetmeat of Kunwar Bakhtawar Singh for ever

Raj Jaipur had two claims against Khetri, one that the Mamla of Bibai should be paid in Hali (Jaipur) coins and secondly a demand of Rs 1859-7-0 *viz* Rs. 1376/- on account of Kharach Rs 388/- on account of Batta Ikotri and Rs 95-7 on account of Bhait of Shri Govindji Khetri objected that the mamla was never paid in Hali coins but in Jhunjanoos Currency as has been done in the payment of mamla for Jhunjhanu, Narhar and Singhana In this connection the officials of Jaipur have produced a writting (Likhawat) of Raja Abhey Singh in which he has clearly promised to pay the money in Hali coins therefore the amount of Mamla of Bibai should be paid in Hali coins from Sambat 1889 because the settlement

of account up to Sampat 1888 had taken place according to the decision of Col. Locket. As the amount of Batta for Hali coins instead of Madhopuri for so many years would come to a big sum and there is indebtedness and mismanagement in Khetri on account of minority of the Chief therefore it should be recovered in Sambats 1898 and 1899 in two equal instalments Regarding the second claim of Rs. 1859-7-0 Khetri argues that it has never paid this amount and the officials of Jaipur have not been able to explain as to what is meant by Kharach for which the amount is demanded and why Batta Ikotri and Bhait Sriji is charged. No documentry proof to establish the above claim has been produced by Jaipur and unless an adequate proof is given the amount of Rs 1859-7-0 can not be demanded.

Therefore the due amount of mamla payable by Khetri to Raj Jaipur is as detailed below —

(1) Mamla for Jhunjhanu, Narhar & Udaipur		Rs.	17,861	0	0
(2) Mamla for Singhana		Rs.	51,200	0	0
	Total	Rs.	69,061	0	0

Deduction on account of "Chhoot" for

Pun ...	Rs	608	0	0			
Patta ...	„	12,000	0	0			
Inam for Khetri	„	3,000	0	0			
Khudana ...	„	2,400	0	0			
On A/c of Sah Sri Kishan	„	800	0	0	21,308	0	0
Balance	Rs.				47,756	0	0
Disallowance from Mamla (Bharnaki Kasar)	„				8,954	4	0
Net					38,801	12	0

Further deduction on account Bhayan Sarishata (vide Prohit Mahji Dass' letter)	Rs.	6000	0	0			
Shirni for Kunwar Bhaktawar Singh (up to 1897)	Rs.	2000	0	0			
		8000	0	0			
Bharna ki kasar		1500	0	0			
		6500	0	0	6,500	0	0
Balance	Rs.				32,301	12	0

Therefore the account should be settled till Sambat 1897 as detailed above The demand from Sambat 1898 shall be as detailed below:—

(1) According to the account up to Sambat 1897	Rs.	32,301	12	0
(2) Disallowance of Shirni Rs. 2000 Minus Rs. 375 on account of Kasrat for Bharna	Rs.	1,625		
Total	Rs.	33,926	12	0

APPENDDIX E—(Babai Papers A)

List of Sanads and papers relating to grant of Pargana Babai to Khetri Chief.

Serial No.	Nature of paper.	Date.	From Whom	To Whom	Subject	Remarks
			MOGHUL COURT DELHI.			
1.	Sanad (Persian)	Regnal years 23. Shah Alam (11 Jamadiula-wal Hijri 1195) (A D 1781)	Bakhshiul-mulk Najaf-Quli Khan Bahadur.	Chaudhris Qanungos Mutsaddis and peasants of Pargana Babai	Grant of entire (Darobast) Pargana of Babai to Thakur Bagh Singh under the orders of the Emperor	Khetri File No. 4.
2	Do	Jalus Year 32 (1790 A D)	Marhatta Seal	Do of Parganas Udaipur etc	Grant of 4 Parganas of Udaipur, Singhana Jhunjhun and Narhar to Bagh Singh Shekhawat	Do.
			DARBAR JAIPUR.			
3	Hindi Parwana (order)	Mangsar Sudi 1 St 1848 (1791 A.D)	Bohra Raja Khushali Ram and Daulat-Ram	Mutsaddi of Shekh-awatti.	Grant of 22 villages of Gurha etc of Taluqa Udaipur to Bagh Singh on payment of usual rent	Do.
4	Do	Mangsar Sudi 14 St 1848 (1791 A D) Khas Mohar)	Sri Sawai Partab Singh Ji Bahadur Maharajah	Do.	Allotting 41 villages of Taluqa Babai to the Khetri Raja (Bagh Singh)	Do.
5	Do	Do	Bohra Rajah Khushali Ram and Daulat Ram	Salamat Singh	Ordering to have the possession of 22 villages Gurha etc. of Bagh Singh effected.	Do.
6.	Hindi letter	Asar Budi 11 St 1851 1794 A D)	Raj Sri Jiwaji Lal.	Gumashta of Bag Singh	Re: payment of Rs. 4,500/- as Mamla for 41 villages of Babai.	Do.
7	Memo Huzuri Office Jaipur	Bhadon Budi 13 St 1869 (1812 A D)	...	..	Grant of title of "Raja" to Bagh Singh and that a Salam was performed for the grant of Babai.	Do.
8	Account of Pargana Sri Madhopur for St 1870	Asoj Budi 5 Sambat 1870	Missar Sheo-Narain	Jaipur Mutsaddi	Fixing Mamla of Babai at Rs 4,500/- and a Nazrana of Rs 1,00,000/- (one lac)	Do.

(Continued)

Serial No.	Nature of paper	Date	From Whom	To Whom	Subject	Remarks
9	Hindi order	Katak Sudi 3 St. 1871 (1814 A D.)	Missar Sheo-Narain	Mutsaddi Shekhawati	Grant of 22 villages of Babai with town customs, Mines & Minting rights to Rajah Abhye-Singh on an annual Mamla of Rs. 4,500/- from generation to generation.	Khetri File No. 4.
10	Sanad Hindi	Do	Do	Rajah Abhye Singh	Do	
11	Do	Mangsar Sudi 3 St. 1871 (1814 A. D)	Do	Do	Do	
12	English letter	January, 1814.	Sir Charles Metcalfe	Do	Expressing his pleasure and congratulating Raja Abhye Singh on the bestowal of Pargana Babai on him by Maharaja Jagat Singh Bahadur of Jaipur.	
13	Hindi letter	Asarh Sudi 12 St 1875 (1818 A. D.)	Tewari Mohan Ram	Do	Fixing Babai Mamla for St. 1875 at 40000/- for St. 1876 at 42000/- for St. 1877 at 44000/- Rupees.	
14	Khas Mohar Parwana	Mah Sudi 3 (St. 1878 A.D.) (26-1-1822)	Maharaja Sawai Jai Singh	Do	Grant of 22 villages of Babai to Raja Abhye Singh as his ancestral villages with all rights of customs, Mines and Minting and cesses from generation to generation on payment of Rs. 44,000/- annually.	

15 Statement of Babai income from 1798 to 1812 A. D.

16 Grants made by Raja Bagh Singh in Babai Parganah from St. 1842 to St. 1856 (A D. 1785 to 1799).

17 Jaipur Council order dated 26-12-1891 admitting the claim of Raja Ji Khetri over Babai Mines.

18 Extracts from Col: Lockett's Journal and Report on Shekhawatti.

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 1)

Translation of a Persian Farman of Moghul Court dated 11 Jamadi-ul-Awal Jalus year 23 of Shah Alam.

Bakhshi-ul-Mulk

Saifud-daula

Najaf Quli Khan Bahadur

Muzaffar Jang

Fidwi Badshah Ghazi Shah Alam

1191 Hijri Jalus Year 19.

Be it known to The Chaudhris, Kanungos, Mutasaddis and cultivators of Parganah Bibai that whareas the said entire (Darobost) Parganah has been granted in the Jaidad (estate or property) of the exalted and dignified Thakur Bagh Singh under the command of Hazur (Emperor) with effect from Fasli year 1189, it is incumbent on you to regard the said Thakur as "Sahib Jaidad Mustaqil" (permanent proprietor) and act according to his good will, wishes and advice and remain contented.

As regards the Thakur he should keep the people pleased and satisfied with good treatment and make every effort in the cause of their "Abadi" (inhabitation) improvement of cultivation and enhancement of revenue. No neglect should be shown in this matter. He should also see that the assessment of proper revenue and the collections are done on the right time and included with his own collections.

The above orders are to be strictly complied with.

Dated 11th Jamadi-ul-Awal Jalus Year 23 (A. D. 1781)

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 2)

Translation of a Persian Farman dated Jaloos year 32.

Seal in Marathi.

Sri Jotish
Swampachi
Rana Nagar
Maharaja
Sri Datantar

} Not clearly decipherable

Be it known to Chodhris and Kanoogos of Pargana Udiapur etc. as detailed below that where as these parganas have been granted to and put in possession of Bagh Singh Shekhawat therefore you should consider him as your permanent Amil (ruler) and behave as loyal subject and pay revenue No neglect should be shown You are strictly warned to act accordingly

FOUR PARGANAS.

Pargana Udaipur | Pargana Singhana
I | I
Pargana Jhunjhnu | Narhar
I | I

Daded 5th Ramzan Jaloos years 32. (1790 A.D.)

(Note)

Here is Marahti writing under the same seal.

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 3.)

Translation of a Hindi Likhawat of Raj Sawai Jaipur dated Mangsar Sudi 1st Sambat 1848 (1791 A. D.)

Be it known from Bohra Raja Khushali Ram, Daulat Ram to Sidh Sri Mutsaddi of Shekhawati that it is all well here and your welfare is desired The 22 villages of Gurha etc, that belonged to Taluq Udaipur, have now been given to Bagh Singh Shekhawat So you have to see that the due demand on account of these villages is realised and credited

Dated Mangsar Sudi 1st Sambat 1848 (A. D. 1791).

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 4.)

Translation of Parwana (of Khas Mohar) of Jaipur, dated Mangsar Sudi 14 Sambat 1848

Be it known from Sidh Sri Maharaja Dhiraj Maharaja Sri Sawai Partab Singhji to the Mutsaddi of Shekhawatti that the Taluqa of Babai has been allotted (Talluq kiu chhai) to Bagh Singh Shekhawat as per detail bellow:—

(1) The 22 villages that formerly belonged to him.

(2) The 22 villages of Udaipur

Therefore have his *Amal* established in the above Taluqa and realise the Mamla amount from him according to what was formerly fixed.

Dated Mangsar Sudi 14 Sambat 1848. (A D. 1791)

APPENDIX. E (Babai Paper No. 5)

Translation of a Hindi Likhawat of Raj Sawai Jaipur dated Mangsar Sudi 14th Sambat 1848 (1791 A D.).

With compliments. From Bohra Raja Khushali Ram, Daulat Ram to Raj Sri Salamat Singh You are required to have the possession of Bagh Singhji effected over Gurha etc 22 villages Do not delay in this matter.

Rao Shimbha Singhji's letter regarding Khegrauli etc 8 villages has also been sent, so it should be properly forwarded to Diwani.

Dated Mangsar Sudi 14th Sambat 1848 (1791 A.D.).

APPENDIX. E (Babai Paper No. 6)

Translation of a Hindi Likhawat from Sri Jewaji Lal (Marhatta) dated Asar Budi 14th St 1851 (1794 A D)

Round Seal in
Marhatti

With compliments from Rao Sri Jewaji Lal be it known to the Gumashta of Thakran Bagh Singh that as usual you are required to pay Rs. 4,500/- on account of 44 villages of Pargana Babai. Rest assured nothing more shall be demanded.

Dated Asar Budi 14th Sambat 1851 (1794 A.D.).

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 7.)

Translation of a Hindi writing of Hazuri Office of Raj Sawai Jaipur, dated Bhadon Budi 13 Sambat 1869. This is P. S. 386 Sambat 1869 (1812 A. D.).

Tharwara ka Bagh, Bhadwa Budi 13 Monday.

Title of "Raja" granted to Abhye Singh son of Bagh Singh Shekhawat of Khetri for which Salaam was performed and "Nazar" presented. Also Salaam was performed on account of Tamqa Babai of Parganah Madhoour.

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 8.)

Shri Ramji

Mosana (account) of pargana Shri Madhopur Taluqa Babai Sambat 1870.

Writing of Missar Sheonarain dated Asoj Budi 5th Sambat 1870 (1813 A D)

It is hereby written to you in compliance with the order of Shri Huzoor that the *ijara* of Pargana Babai has been given to Raja Abhye Singh Sheikhawat of Khetri with effect from Sambat 1870. So have the possession made over Rs 4,500/- annually in Hali coins has been fixed for mamla as before and have the amount realised and credited. *A sum of Rs 1,00,001/- (one lac) has been settled on account of Nazarana which he shall credit here in the Treasury and obtain a receipt.* He shall render service to the Darbar with his troops (Jamiat).

N. B.—This is P. S. No 387 of the State.

APPENDIX. E (*Babai Paper No. 9*)

Translation of a Hindi likhawat of Raj Sawai Jaipur dated Katak Sudi 3 Sambat 1871 (1814 A.D.).

Round Seal
of
Raj Sawai
Jaipur

Be it known from Missar Sheo Narain to Sidh Sri Mutsaddi of Shekhawat that it is all well here and your welfare is desired. This is written to you in obedience of the orders of Sri Hazoor that the 22 villages of Pargana Babai with Qasba, Zakat, Kanat, Dariba and Cesses etc have been bestowed by the Darbar upon Raja *Abhye Singh* Shekhawat. The Mamla of these villages has continued to be fixed at Rs 4,500/- from before. Therefore the same amount should be taken from him annually from generation to generation; nothing more to be demanded over and above this amount

Dated *Katak* Sudi 3rd Sambat 1871.

APPENDIX. E (Babai Paper No. 10)

Translation of a Hindi Sanad of Raj Sawai Jaipur dated Katak Sudi 3rd Sambat 1871 (1814 A D.).

With compliments from Missar Sheo Narain to Sidh Sri Sarbopman Raja Ji Sri Abhye Singh Ji. It is all well here and the welfare of the Raj is always desired, you are informed in obedience to the orders of the Sri Ji that the 22 villages of Pargana Babai with Town, Zakat, Kanat, Dariba and Cesses have been granted to you by him The Mamla of these villages has remained fixed at Rs. 4,500/- ever since So continue to pay the same annually from generation to generation Nothing more shall be demanded.

Dated Katak Sudi 3rd Sambat 1871.

APPENDIX. E (Babai Paper No. 11)

Translation of a Hindi letter (Sanad) of Raj Sawai Jaipur dated Mangsar Sudi 3rd Sambat 1871

Round Seal
of
Raj Sawai
Jaipur

Be it known with compliments from Missar Sheo Narain to Sidh Sri Sarbopman Raja Ji Sri Abhye-Singh Ji that it is all well here and the welfare of the Raj (yourself) is always desired. This is written in obedience to the orders of the Sri Ji that he has bestowed upon you Pargana Babai 22 villages with Town, Zakat, Kanat, Dariba and Cesses, Rs. 4,500/- on account of Mamla of these villages has remained fixed ever since So continue to pay the same annually from generation to generation. Nothing more shall be demanded.

Dated Mangsar Sudi 3rd Sambat 1871 (1814 A.D.).

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 12.)

Translation of a Persian Kharita of Sir Charles Metcalfe dated January 1814 (date not given addressed to Raja Abhye Singh.

With complements I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter through your Vakil Phonkar Singh informing me of your having obtained Taluqa Babai which the Maharaja Sawai Jagat Singh Bahadur has benevolently and kindly bestowed upon you Your this letter has given me immense pleasure as the news of prosperity and success of a sincere friend like you is always a source of happiness to me I send you my congratulations and request you to continue to write to me regarding your welfare It is all well here

Sd C Metcalfe

Dated January 1814

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 13.)

Shri Ramji

Be it known with compliments from Tewari Shri Munna Ram to Raja Abhey Singh that the amount of Mamla Ijara of Pargana Bibai with "Zakat and Kanat" for the following years has been fixed as bellow :—

Sambat 1875 Rs 40000/-
Sambat 1876 Rs 42000/-
Sambat 1877 Rs 44000/-

The above should be paid in the harvest noted below:

Sambat 1875	Sakh Sawanu	Rs. 17000/-
	Sakh Unalu	Rs. 23000/-
Sambat 1876	Sakh Sawanu	Rs. 18000/-
	Sakh Unala	Rs 24000/-
Sambat 1877	Sakh Sawanu	Rs 19000/-
	Sakh Unala	Rs. 25000/-

i. e. Rs 126000/- for three years on account of the following villages :—

(1) Babai (2) Papruna (3) Dada (4) Teonda (5) Mehara (6) Gadrata (7) Nalpur (8) Rampura (9) Partabpura (10) Mandana (11) Dhani (12) Chondara (13) Dalailpura (14) Kankeria (15) Padeva (16) Madhogarh (17) Bhitaira (18) Shampura (19) Bankoti (20) Bansial (21) Kalota (22) Badalwas.

Dated Sadh Sudi 12 Sambat 1875 (A. D 1818)

N. B —The original is with the Thakur Sahib of Chanana

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 14)

Translation of a Hindi Sanad of Raj Sawai Jaipur dated Mah Sudi 3rd Sambat 1878 (1821 A.D)

("Katar" mark and Seal on the front)

From Sidh Sri Maharajah Dhiraj Maharaja Sri Sawai Jai Singh Ji to Raja Abhye Singh Shekhawat.

You have represented that the 22 villages of Taluq Babai belonging to Pargana Madhopur were granted to you on the condition that Rs. 4,500/- on account of their Mamla be paid annually and receipt taken from the treasury but that recently for the last 2 or 3 years the Diwan of Sarkar has created trouble and Rs 41,000/- is demanded on account of the Mamla and that you pray that the same amount of Mamla should be realized as has always been done before and orders be passed to this effect This is hereby declared that the 22 villages of the said Taluqa are granted to you with Towns, Zakat, Kanat, Dariba and Abwab and you should consider these villages as those of your Bapoti (*i.e.*, hereditary). You should pay Rs 44,000/- annually and obtain receipts. The Diwan of Sarkar shall not demand any thing over and above this amount for these villages.

Dated Mah Sudi 3rd Sambat 1878 (1821 A.D.)

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No 15)

Statement showing realisation of income from Pargana Babai from Sambat 1855-1869 (1798-1812 A D), which shows that this pargana did not go completely out of the possession of Khetri during this period

Sambat	Land Revenue	Customs	Mint	Nota	Total
	Rs as ps	Rs as ps	Rs as ps	Rs. as ps.	Rs as ps
1855 (1798 A D)	579 9 6	.	165 6 6		715 0 0 *
1856 (1799 A D)	18 8 0	...	29 0 0	...	47 8 0 *
1857 (1800 A D)	1230 12 0		...	218 0 0	4,448 12 0 §
1861 (1804 A D)	...	...	257 8 6	...	258 8 6 †
1862 (1805 A D)	662 3 0	940 10 0	608 2 0	...	2,203 15 0 †
1865 (1808 A D)	.	..	535 3 9	.	535 3 9 †
1868 (1811 A D)	45 1 3	. .	209 8 3	...	254 9 6 !
1869 (1812 A D)	36 0 0	...	9,039 1 3	...	9,075 1 3 ×

* Bahi No 6 (Bishan Dyal)
§ Bahi No 7 (Janki Lal)
† Khetri Fard No. 2, 3 and 4
! Bahi No 8 (Bishan Dyal) and Fard No 5
× Bahi No 8 and 9 (Bishan Dyal)

APPENDIX E (Babai Paper No. 16)

List of Pattas of Pargana Babai 1785—1799 A. D.

Serial No.	Nature of Paper	Date: Sambat.	Date: Calendar year A. D.	Brief particulars.
1	Patta	Mah Sudi 6 St. 1842	1785	Grant from Raja Bagh Singh to Swami Mansaram of 3¾ Takas daily from the customs income of Babai.
2	Hukumnama	Poh Budi 9 St. 1844	1787	Regarding cotinuance of payment of allowance and cotton to Swami Mangsaram.
3	Patta	1 Jeth Budi 2 St 1845 2 Jeth Budi 4 St 1848	1788 1791	Grant from Raja Bagh Singh to Ratna (Ratan Ram) of well and land in villages Dalepura and Babai, etc.
4	Patta	Bhadwa Sudi 3 St 1846	1789	Grant from Raja Bagh Singh to Gulab Rai Shitab Rai Kanugoes of Babai of well and land in pargana Babai.
5	Patta	Phagun Budi 1 St 1851	1794	Grant from Raja Bagh Singh to Ram Bhagat Hirdai Ram of land and reduction of Zawad of village Badalwas.
6	Hukumnama	Mah Budi 5 St. 1852	1795	Regarding appointment of Ram Bhagat Hirdai Ram to manage the affairs of Pargana Babai.
7	Parwana	Bhadon Budi 1 St. 1853	1796	Calling Kewal Ram Ijardar Babai to settle his acconnt.
8	Rukka	Asarh Budi 5 St. 1854	1797	To the address of Ratan Ram to give hundred mds of grain to the workmen employed for construction of the Garh at Babai.
9	Parwana	Poh Budi 10 St 1854	1797	To the address of Muqadams of Mehra for payment of Rs 250/- to Ratanram on account of horses.
10	Hukumnama	Mah Sudi 5 St 1854	1797	To the Zamindars of Mehra for payment of Rs. 1,200/-.
11	Patta	Bhadon Sudi 5 St 1855	1798	Grant from Raja Bagh Singhji to Lachhman Das of well and land in Charwas etc, in exchange of land in Babai.
12	Patta	Bhadon Budi 5 St. 1855	1798	Grant from Raja Bagh Singh to Ratan Ram of well and land in Singhana etc., in exchange of land in pargana Babai.
13	Patta	Jeth Sudi 9 St 1856	1799	Grant from Raja Bagh Singh to Ramrikh of land in village Rampura (Pargana Babai) and in other parganas.

APPENDIX. E (Babai Paper No. 17)

Residency
Jaipur dated 28-12-1891.

To

To Raja Ajit Singh Bahadur
Raja of Khetri

My dear friend,

In reply to your note of the 29th November, I have the pleasure to inform you that the Darbar being now satisfied that you are entitled to all mining rights in the Babai Taluqa has no objection to your including the Babai Mines in the proposed lease

As you have no documentary proof in support of your idea that the Taluqa is not an actual grant and as that idea is not consistent with the fact of your paying the Darbar a fixed annual sum for the taluqa which sum is not called Mamla in the Darbar documents and is therefore evidently a quit rent (Istamrar payment) on a perpetual lease, I think you should rest content *with the recognition of your mining rights which is the important point* I am now forwarding a report on the whole matter

Yours sincerely,
Sd. A. B. Abbot, Lt.-Col.,
Offg. Resident.

Translation of a note showing the proceedings in Jaipur Council of the case relating to grant of lease of Babai Mines by Khetri.

I Following is the translation of the Offg Resident Jaipur's letter No. 561 dated 6th March, 1891 :—

"I shall be glad to know in the matter of the proposed grant of lease of Khetri mines as to what rights are enjoyed by the Rajaji of Khetri in respect of the mines As the Mining leases have formerly been granted therefore it appears that the Rajaji Khetri is authorised to make such agreements. An early reply of the Raj is requested".

II. The following reply was sent to the Resident on 28-3-91.

"The Darbar has no objection to the grant of mining lease in respect of the territory of Khetri proper but the Rajaji of Khetri has no mining rights in respect of the tracts, villages and lands which have been granted to him by the Darbar on istamrar tenure The Darbar understands that the completion of the proceedings of this lease should be effected through the Resident and therefore according to the procedure the matter shall be laid before the Darbar for a reply to the Resident and communication by him to the Rajaji and then the Council shall be able to express their views as regards the terms on which the Rajaji desires to give a lease".

III The following letter dated 1-4-1891 was sent in reply by the Resident :—

"The Darbar is requested kindly to send by a very early date a list of the villages and lands given by the Darbar to the Rajaji of Khetri on Istamrar Tenure".

IV Accordingly the officials of Kutchery Diwani were ordered by the Foreign Department on 4-5-1891 that a report be submitted in this connection

The following is the report of Anandi Lal of Kutchery Diwani after inquiry from the officials concerned :—

"It is submitted that 22 villages of Babai were given on Ijara to Abhye Singh Raja of Khetri for three years from Sambat 1875 to 1877 on payment of Rs 1,26,000/- [one lac and twenty six thousand] which was credited by the Thikana according to the Ijara as appears from the office records. Dated Chait Budi 10 Sambat 1947 or 14th April, 1891".

V. Jamna Lal Vakil of Khetri presented a copy of the following writing with his application on 22-8-1891 :—

"Be it known from Mishra Sheonarain with complements to Rajaji Abhai Singhji that this is hereby written to you in compliance of the order of the Shriji that the 22 villages of Pargana Babai with town, Zakat, Kanat, Danba, and Bab have been bestowed upon you by the Darbar, Rs 4,500/- are paid for them from before So you should pay the same annually from generation to generation Nothing more shall be demanded from you"

"Dated Katik Sudi 3rd Sambat 1871"

The accounts presented by the Vakil of Khetri show that when the Taluqa Babai was given on Istamrar to Raja Abhai Singhji by the Raj, there were copper mines in the said Pargana and their income was also afterwards continued to be realised by Khetri. Therefore it is our opinion that a reply be sent to the Resident according to the draft reply and the Khetri Vakil directed to present the draft lease prepared by Messrs. Cass & Co stipulating the terms accepted by the Khetri Rajaji upon the receipt of which final decision shall be communicated to the Resident Dated 6-11-1891.

VI. In the Note presented by the Khetri Vakil in response to the Council finding dated 29-11-1891 it has been argued that the said pargana was not granted on Istamrar tenure but from the record of Diwani office it appears that this allegation of Khetri Rajaji is totally groundless The record show that in Sambat 1838 (A D. 1781) Taluqa Babai consisting of 23 villages was granted in Jagir to Mahant Janki Das and its income was at that time assessed at Rs 80,000/- (eighty thousand). In Sambat 1855 (A.D. 1798) the Zamindara of this Pargana was given to Awaz Singh Rajawat on payment of a Nazrana of Rs 54,500/- and an annual demand of Rs. 4,500/-.

In Sambat 1856 one village Rampura out of the villages of Taluqa Babai was given in Udak by Awaz Singh Rajawat to Shami Udai Ram Ram Baksh Dadupanthi which was upheld by the Darbar in Sambat 1868 and a patta of it granted to the said Shami.

In Sambat 1870 the Ijara of Pargana Babai was given to Raja Abhai Singhji of Khetri on payment of a Nazrana of Rs. one lac and one (Rs. 1,00,001/-) on the understanding that the Rajaji shall render service to the Raj with his troops

Again in 1875 the Ijara of the Pargana was renewed in favour of Raja Abhai Singh and according to agreement the Ijara amount was fixed at Rs. 40,000/- for Sambat 1875, Rs 42,000/- for Sambat 1876 and Rs. 44,000/- for Sambat 1877 *Since that time the Pargana continues to remain in the*

Ijara Istamrar of Khetri on payment of Rs. 44,000/- annually in the Raj-Treasury. These papers shall prove fully to the Rajaji of Khetri that this Taluqa was given on Ijara to him by the Darbar and there cannot be accepted any argument of its not being in Istamrar tenure.

Now as to the rights of mines of Rajaji Khetri in this Istamrar tenure of Taluqa the record of Diwani perused show that there exists in them such a condition which though it does not clearly define but it does support the claim of the Rajaji of Khetri.

The record of Sambat 1875 show that the Taluqa of Babai was given in Ijara to Raja Abhai Singh with "Zakat" and "Kanat", although the real meaning of the word "Kanat" cannot be explained but it can be understood safely that it means the produce of mines Therefore we are of opinion that the Khetri Vakil be informed that the Darbar has no objection to the inclusion of all rights of Babai mines by the Rajaji of Khetri in the lease proposed to be granted to Messrs. Cass and Co.

Information to this effect be given by an English docket to the Resident, a copy sent to the Rajaji Khetri and copies of records of Diwani with their translation in English sent to the Residency. The papers be laid before the Ijlas of all Members. Dated 26-12-1891.

The above is approved by all members. Dated 26-12-1891.
